Editorial

Cancer-related networks: A help to understand, predict and change malignant transformation

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Cancer is increasingly described as a systems-level, network phenomenon. Genetic methods, such as next generation sequencing and RNA interference uncovered the complexity tumor-specific mutation-induced effects and the identification of multiple target sets. Network analysis of cancer-specific metabolic and signaling pathways highlighted the structural features of cancer-related proteins and their complexes to develop next-generation protein kinase inhibitors, as well as the modulation of inflammatory and autophagic pathways in anti-cancer therapies. Importantly, malignant transformation can be described as a two-phase process, where an initial increase of system plasticity is followed by a decrease of plasticity at late stages of tumor development. Late-stage tumors should be attacked by an indirect network influence strategy. On the contrary, the attack of early-stage tumors may target central network nodes. Cancer stem cells need special diagnosis and targeting, since they potentially have an extremely high ability to change the rigidity/plasticity of their networks. The early warning signals of the activation of fast growing tumor cell clones are important in personalized diagnosis and therapy. Multi-target attacks are needed to perturb cancer-specific networks to exit from cancer attractors and re-enter a normal attractor. However, the dynamic non-genetic heterogeneity of cancer cell population induces the replenishment of the cancer attractor with surviving, non-responsive cells from neighboring abnormal attractors. The development of drug resistance is further complicated by interactions of tumor clones and their microenvironment. Network analysis of intercellular cooperation using game theory approaches may open new areas of understanding tumor complexity. In conclusion, the above applications of the network approach open up new, and highly promising avenues in anti-cancer drug design.

1. Cancer and the malignant transformation process as a network phenomenon

Malignant transformation is increasingly described as a systems-level, network phenomenon. Healthy and tumor cells can be understood as networks, if their nodes and edges are precisely defined. Nodes may be amino acids of cancer-related proteins, where edges are their distances in the 3D protein structure. Nodes may be defined as protein/RNA molecules or DNA-segments, where edges are their physical or signaling contacts. In metabolic networks nodes are metabolites and edges are the enzymes, which catalyze the reactions to convert them to each other. Analysis of network topology and, especially, network dynamics can predict novel anti-cancer drug targets. Incorporation of personalized data, such as mutations, signalome (e.g. phosphoproteome) or metabolome profiles to molecular networks may enhance patient- and disease stage-specific drug targeting in anti-cancer therapies [1–3]. Patient specificity can differentiate network behavior in at least four different levels: (A) at the level of the genetic background (e.g., single-nucleotide polymorphisms and other mutations); (B) at the level of gene expression changes (caused by e.g. transcriptional, epigenetic or microRNA mediated changes); (C) at the level of the microenvironment (e.g. neighboring cells, tissue structure, etc.); and finally (D) by exogenous signals (e.g. nutrients or drugs), which all provide increments to the patient-specific, context-dependent responses to anti-cancer therapy [4–6]. Contributions to this special issue address all the above scenarios.

Cancer is a complex disease, where magic-bullet type drugs may often fail. Degenerate (partially redundant) signaling pathways are hallmarks of cancer robustness. Thus an inhibitor of a particular hallmark of cancer may not be sufficient to block a related function. Moreover, inhibitors of a specific cancer hallmark may strengthen another hallmark, like certain types of angiogenesis inhibitors increased the rate of metastasis. In most failures of anti-cancer therapies, either system robustness or off-target effects prevented the accomplishment of the desired pharmacological goal. Combination therapies and multi-target drugs may both overcome system robustness and provide less side-effects [7–12]. Moreover, tumors contain a highly heterogeneous cell population that could be efficiently inhibited only by drug combinations. Cell populations and their drug responses can be perceived as a bipartite graph, where cell populations and drugs form two different node sets having no

connections inside them, but being connected, when a drug inhibits a cell population. Applying minimal hitting set analysis allowed the search for effective drug combinations at the inter-cellular network level [13]. Last but not least the billion development routes to cancer states define a highly heterogeneous patient profile depending on personal genetic background and life-history. As a recently published example, consensus-based unsupervised clustering of gene expression profiles from 1290 colorectal cancer tumors identified 6 clinically relevant disease subtypes, where different treatment modalities were proved to be optimal [14]. The network analysis approaches described in this special issue may enrich and extend these studies.

2. Network descriptions of cancer from protein structures to cellular communities

In the opening contribution of this series, Lauffenburger and co-workers [15–17] analyze the richness of cancer RNA interference (RNAi) studies from the network point of view. As they summarize: "Interpreting RNAi results in a network framework instead of merely as individual 'hits' or 'targets' leverages contributions from all hit/target contributions to pathways via their relationships with other network nodes". This leads to the integration of multiple data sets of experimental results, improved target identification, as well as the creation of testable hypotheses for therapeutic development.

Another highly powerful genomic analysis tool, next generation sequencing is addressed by Bates and co-workers [18,19]. "Network analysis approaches have become an invaluable tool to predict and interpret mutations that are associated with tumor survival and progression. Our understanding of cancer mechanisms is further enhanced by mapping protein structure information to such networks." A typical solid tumor harbors tens to hundreds of non-synonymous somatic mutations, where subgroups of tumor cells differ in their mutation spectrum: approximately 50% of the mutations found in one biopsy may not be shared with other biopsies from the same patient. Network analysis may provide sub-groups of this large diversity. The development of analytical tools that are able to quantify the dynamic impact of mutations on a network will bring valuable insights into the disease mechanism of mutations at the molecular level.

The metabolism of cancer cells is adapted to meet their proliferative needs in predominantly anaerobic conditions. Sharma and König [20,21] give a summary of the methodology of metabolic modeling proven to be useful for modeling the deregulated metabolism of cancer cells. They also evaluate statistical analyses identifying cancer-specific metabolic pathways.

Signaling-related anti-cancer therapies increasingly outnumber metabolism-related chemotherapy options. From the network point of view this trend is due to the high complexity of signaling networks in humans, and to the increased selectivity of signaling interactions as compared to metabolism-related targeting [3]. From the three signaling-related papers of the issue Tsai and Nussinov [3,22,23] describe the molecular basis of protein kinase targeting in anti-cancer therapies. They "exploit a conceptual framework explaining why suppressed kinase activity will selectively kill only the so-called oncogene 'addicted' cancer cell, while sparing the healthy cell." Tsai and Nussinov argue that "understanding the detailed activation mechanism of individual kinases is essential to relate the observed oncogenic alterations to the elevated constitutively active state, to identify the mechanism of consequent drug resistance, and to guide the development of the next-generation inhibitors." They also discuss "scenarios of drug resistance and relapse by compensating lesions that bypass the inactivated pathway in a vertical or horizontal fashion", and

conclude that personalized combination therapies are needed to overcome the robustness of kinase-related signaling pathways.

Chronic inflammation is increasingly understood to play a major role in all phases of tumorigenesis, including tumor initiation, promotion and metastasis. Nussinov and co-workers [3,22,24,25] describe the Toll-like receptor pathway playing a central role in inflammation and carcinogenesis. They use the PRotein Interactions by Structural Matching (PRISM, [24]) tool to reveal a structure-based orchestration of the Toll-like receptor pathway highlighting the role of myeloid differentiation primary response protein, MyD88.

Autophagy, a highly regulated self-degradation process of eukaryotic cells, is a context-dependent tumor-suppressing mechanism that can also promote tumor cell survival upon stress and treatment resistance. Kubisch et al. [3,26–28] show "how systems-level knowledge on autophagy regulation can help to develop new strategies and efficiently select novel anti-cancer drug targets." Focusing on the protein interactors and transcriptional/post-transcriptional regulators of autophagy they list several network resources, benchmark the presence of autophagy core proteins in them, and "point out that a context-dependent modulation of autophagy would be favored in anti-cancer therapy, where autophagy is stimulated in normal cells, while inhibited only in stressed cancer cells." They introduce the concept of "regulo-network drugs targeting specific transcription factors or miRNA families identified with network analysis. The effect of regulo-network drugs propagates indirectly through transcriptional or post-transcriptional regulation of autophagy proteins, and, as a multi-directional intervention tool, they can both activate and inhibit specific proteins in the same time. The future identification and validation of such regulo-network drug targets may serve as novel intervention points, where autophagy can be effectively modulated in cancer therapy."

Gyurkó et al. [3,29,30] propose that malignant transformation is a two-phase process, where an initial increase of system plasticity is followed by a decrease of plasticity at late stages of carcinogenesis as a model of cellular learning. They describe the hallmarks of increased system plasticity of early, tumor initiating cells, as increased noise, entropy, conformational and phenotypic plasticity, physical deformability, cell heterogeneity and network rearrangements. Importantly, a more ordered system is generally less controllable than a disordered one [31], which prompts Gyurkó et al. to warn that (A) therapeutic interventions of the early, more plastic stage of carcinogenesis are more efficient than those against late-stage tumors; (B) late-stage tumors should be attacked by an entirely different strategy than early-stage tumors. They suggest that plastic/flexible networks of early phase cancer development need a hit on their central nodes, while rigid networks of late stage primary tumors or established metastases should be attacked by the network influence strategy, such as by edgetic, multi-target, or allo-network drugs [3,29,32]. They argue that application of early stage-optimized anti-cancer drugs to late-stage patients may be a reason of many failures in anti-cancer therapies. Importantly, heterogeneous cancer cell populations may harbor early- and late-stage tumor cells at the same time. The hypotheses presented in this paper underlie the need for patient-specific multi-target therapies applying the correct ratio of central hits and network influences [3] — in an optimized sequence.

As an important part of their hypotheses, Gyurkó et al. propose that cancer stem cells need special diagnosis and targeting, since their dormant and rapidly proliferating forms may have more rigid, or more plastic networks, respectively. The extremely high ability of cancer stem cells to change the rigidity/plasticity of their networks may be their key hallmark. The network mechanisms of such behavior are currently unknown, and will be an exciting

area of future studies. Network nodes increasing network plasticity/flexibility may occupy a position similar to that of lattice defects. The highly dynamic inter-modular position of creative nodes [33] may serve this rigidity breaking role ('network melting') quite efficiently. On the contrary, nodes increasing network rigidity may be rigidity-seed nodes establishing a rigid cluster, or may be rigidity-promoting nodes helping the growth of an already existing rigid cluster of network nodes. Decreased dynamics of inter-modular nodes may play a key role in this process causing a rigidity phase transition ('network freezing'). As a rule of thumb, increase of network plasticity shifts the state-space of the network to a smoother energy landscape, while the increase of network rigidity develops a rougher energy landscape. High network plasticity may evoke high system evolvability, while rigid networks may significantly decrease the evolvability of the hosting organism. Thus the delineation of network mechanisms inducing changes in network rigidity/plasticity will have profound consequences on our general understanding of adaptive and evolutionary changes.

Huang and Kauffman expand their seminal papers on attractor structure and cancer attractors [34–37] by emphasizing network dynamics in multi-target design illustrating the limitations of network topology descriptions with the example that the "wiring diagram of a TV is the same whether you watch a sport program or a movie". They discuss the high-dimensional attractor states of cancer cells, and the therapeutic options to perturb cancer-specific networks to exit from cancer attractors and re-enter a normal attractor. They show "how the idea of a quasi-potential landscape and the theory of least-action-path offer a new formal understanding for computing the set of network nodes (molecular targets) that need to be targeted in concert in order to exit the cancer attractor." Importantly, they show that the change from a cancer attractor to an attractor of healthy cells can achieved only by the perturbation of multiple targets. They also warn that "targeting cancer cells based on the network configuration of an 'average' cancer cell, however precise, may not suffice to eradicate all tumor cells because of the dynamic non-genetic heterogeneity of cancer cell populations that makes them moving targets and drives the replenishment of the cancer attractor with surviving, non-responsive cells from neighboring abnormal attractors" forming 'cancerous regions' of the state space.

In a twin-paper Wang and co-workers [38,39] describe the impact of genome sequencing technology for dissecting, quantifying and genetically characterizing clones from tumors. Part 1 of their review includes (A) the computational quantification of tumor subpopulations; (B) clone-based network modeling; (C) cancer hallmark-based networks and their connection to high-order networks; as well as (D) principles of cell survival networks of fast-growing clones. They discuss the promise of network analysis to define cancer subtype-specific treatments. In Part 2 of their review they discuss (E) the evolutionary dynamics of clonal networks; (F) the early-warning signals (e.g., genome duplication events) for formation of fast-growing clones; (G) the dissection of tumor heterogeneity and modeling drug resistance for personalized treatment and (H) models of clone-clone as well as clone–stroma interactions for drug resistance.

Other studies also highlight that microenvironmental control plays a major role in tumor development. The work of Klein and colleagues confirmed that normal fibroblasts inhibited the growth of neoplastic cells in vitro, largely by a contact dependent mechanism. The inhibitory capacity of the fibroblasts differed depending on the site of their origin, and was also different between normal and cancer-derived stroma cells. Preliminary gene analysis pointed out major differences in gene expression in between inhibitory and non inhibitory fibroblasts [40–43].

Adding network complexity to the micro-environmental niche of tumors, in the closing contribution of the network special issue

Csikász-Nagy et al. [44] show that the "network of cell-to-cell contacts makes it possible to characterize the patterns and spatial organization of tissues". They stress that such networks are highly dynamic, and depend on the changes of the tissue architecture caused by cell division, death and migration. They show the changes of epithelial cell topology incorporating 'winner' and 'loser' cells. Importantly, "local competitive and cooperative cell-to-cell interactions influence the choices cells make". They present a "dynamical network model that can be used to explore the evolutionary dynamics of a two dimensional tissue architecture with arbitrary cell-to-cell interactions". They also show that "various forms of experimentally observed types of interactions can be modeled using game theory".

3. Conclusions and perspectives

Collectively, these studies highlight the promises and challenges of the network approach in the description of malignant transformation, tumor progression, metastasis and drug resistance formation, as well as in the design of personalized, cancer-subtype specific, sequential therapies affecting multiple targets in a precise order. Studies of this special issue show that

- genetic methods, such as RNA interference or next generation sequencing uncover the complexity of interacting pathways offering improved understanding the effect of tumor-specific mutations and identification of multiple target sets;
- network analysis of cancer-specific metabolic and signaling pathways highlights the structural details of proteins, as well as their complexes to develop next-generation protein kinase inhibitors, as well as the modulation of inflammatory and autophagic pathways in anti-cancer therapies;
- malignant transformation can be described as a two-phase process, where an initial increase of system plasticity is followed by a decrease of plasticity at late stages of carcinogenesis invoking that late-stage tumors should be attacked by an entirely different strategy than early-stage tumors;
- cancer stem cells need special diagnosis and targeting, since they potentially have an extremely high ability to change the rigidity/plasticity of their networks (undergoing network freezing or melting);
- the early warning signals of the activation of fast growing clones are important in personalized diagnosis and therapy;
- multi-target attacks are needed to perturb cancer-specific networks to exit from cancer attractors and re-enter a normal attractor;
- the dynamic non-genetic heterogeneity of cancer cell population induces the replenishment of the cancer attractor with surviving, non-responsive cells from neighboring abnormal attractors;
- the development of drug resistance is further complicated by interactions of tumor clones and their microenvironment;
- network analysis of intercellular cooperation using game theory approaches may open new areas of understanding tumor complexity.

The above contributions of this special network issue of Seminar in Cancer Biology clearly demonstrate that the network approach opens up new, promising avenues in anti-cancer drug design.

Conflicts of interest

Authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding source

Acknowledgement

References

[1] Dulbecco R. Cancer progression: the ultimate challenge. International Journal of Cancer 1989;44:S6–9.
[2] Hornberg JJ, Bruggeman FJ, Westerhoff HV, Lankelma J. Cancer: a systems biology disease. BioSystems 2006;83:81–90.
[3] Csermely P, Korcsmaros T, Kiss HJM, London G, Nussinov R. Structure and dynamics of molecular networks: a novel paradigm of drug discovery. A comprehensive review. Pharmacology & Therapeutics 2013;138:333–408.
[4] Klinke 2nd DJ. Signal transduction networks in cancer: quantitative parameters influence network topology. Cancer Research 2010;70:1773–82.
[5] Pe'er D, Hacohen N. Principles and strategies for developing network models in cancer. Cell 2011;144:864–73.
[6] Sharma SV, Haber DA, Settleman J. Cell line-based platforms to evaluate the therapeutic efficacy of candidate anticancer agents. Nature Reviews Cancer 2010;10:241–53.
[7] Gupta GP, Nguyen DX, Chiang AC, Bos PD, Kim JY, Nadal C, et al. Mediators of vascular remodelling co-opted for sequential steps in lung metastasis. Nature 2007;446:765–70.
[8] Berger SI, Iyengar R. Network analyses in systems pharmacology. Bioinformatics 2009;25:2466–72.
[9] Wilson TR, Johnston PG, Longley DB. Anti-apoptotic mechanisms of drug resistance in cancer. Current Cancer Drug Targets 2009;9:307–19.
[10] Azmi AS, Wang Z, Philip PA, Mohammad RM, Sarkar FH. Proof of concept: network and systems biology approaches aid in the discovery of potent anticancer drug combinations. Molecular Cancer Therapeutics 2010;9:3137–44.
[11] Glaser B. Genetic analysis of complex disease—a roadmap to understanding or a colossal waste of money. Pediatric Endocrinology Reviews 2010;7:258–65.
[12] Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell 2011;144:646–74.
[13] Vazquez A. Optimal drug combinations and minimal hitting sets. BMC Systems Biology 2009;3:81.
[14] Sadanandam A, Lyssiotis CA, Homicsko K, Collisson EA, Gibb WJ, Wullschleger S, et al. A colorectal cancer classification system that associates cellular phenotype and responses to therapy. Nature Medicine 2013;19:619–25.
[15] Pritchard JR, Bruno PM, Hemann MT, Lauffenburger DA. Predicting cancer drug mechanisms of action using molecular network signatures. Molecular BioSystems 2013;9:1604–19.
[16] Pritchard JR, Bruno PM, Gilbert LA, Capron KL, Lauffenburger DA, Hemann MT. Defining principles of combination drug mechanisms of action. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 2013;110:E170–9.
[17] Jiang H, Pritchard JR, Williams RT, Lauffenburger DA, Hemann MT. A mammalian functional-genetic approach to characterizing cancer therapeutics. Nature Chemical Biology 2011;7:92–100.
[18] Jonsson PF, Bates PA. Global topological features of cancer proteins in the human interactome. Bioinformatics 2006;22:2291–7.
[19] Cheng TM, Gulati S, Agius R, Bates PA. Understanding cancer mechanisms through network dynamics. Briefings in Functional Genomics 2012;11:543–60.
[20] Schramm G, Wiesberg S, Diessl N, Kranz AL, Sagulenko V, Oswald M, et al. Path-Wave: discovering patterns of differentially regulated enzymes in metabolic pathways. Bioinformatics 2010;26:1225–31.
[21] Schramm G, Surmann EM, Wiesberg S, Oswald M, Reinelt G, Eils R, et al. Analyzing the regulation of metabolic pathways in human breast cancer. BMC Medical Genomics 2010;3:39.
[22] Kuzu G, Keskin O, Gursoy A, Nussinov R. Constructing structural networks of signaling pathways on the proteome scale. Current Opinion in Structural Biology 2012;22:367–77.
[23] Buch I, Fishelovitch D, London N, Raveh B, Wolfson HJ, Nussinov R. Allosteric regulation of glycogen synthase kinase 3β: a theoretical study. Biochemistry 2010;49:10890–901.
[24] Keskin O, Nussinov R, Gursoy A. PRISM: protein–protein interaction prediction by structural matching. Methods in Molecular Biology 2008;484:505–21.
[25] Engin HB, Gursoy A, Nussinov R, Keskin O. Network-based strategies can help mono- and poly-pharmacology drug discovery: a systems biology view. Current Pharmaceutical Design 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/13816128113199990066 [in press].
[26] Vellai T, Bicsák B, Tóth ML, Takács-Vellai K, Kovács AL. Regulation of cell growth by autophagy. Autophagy 2008;4:507–9.
[27] Korcsmáros T, Farkas IJ, Szalay MS, Rovó P, Fazekas D, Spiró Z, et al. Uniformly curated signaling pathways reveal tissue-specific cross-talks and support drug target discovery. Bioinformatics 2010;26:2042–50.
[28] Fazekas D, Koltai M, Türei D, Módos D, Pálfy M, Dúl Z, et al. SignaLink 2—a signaling pathway resource with multi-layered regulatory networks. BMC Systems Biology 2013;7:7.
[29] Gáspár ME, Csermely P. Rigidity and flexibility of biological networks. Briefings in Functional Genomics 2012;11:443–56.
[30] Gyurkó D, Sőti C, Steták A, Csermely P. System level mechanisms of adaptation, learning, memory formation and evolvability: the role of chaperone and other networks. Current Protein & Peptide Science 2013 [in press] arXiv:1206.0094.
[31] Rajapakse I, Groudine M, Mesbahi M. Dynamics and control of state-dependent networks for probing genomic organization. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 2011;108:17257–62.
[32] Nussinov R, Tsai CJ, Csermely P. Allo-network drugs: harnessing allostery in cellular networks. Trends in Pharmacological Sciences 2011;32:686–93.
[33] Csermely P. Creative elements: network-based predictions of active centres in proteins and cellular and social networks. Trends in Biochemical Sciences 2008;33:569–76.
[34] Kauffman S. Homeostasis and differentiation in random genetic control networks. Nature 1969;224:177–8.
[35] Kauffman S. Differentiation of malignant to benign cells. Journal of Theoretical Biology 1971;31:429–51.
[36] Huang S, Ernberg I, Kauffman S. Cancer attractors: a systems view of tumors from a gene network dynamics and developmental perspective. Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology 2009;20:869–76.
[37] Huang S. On the intrinsic inevitability of cancer: from foetal to fatal attraction. Seminars in Cancer Biology 2011;21:183–99.
[38] Li J, Lenferink AE, Deng Y, Collins C, Cui Q, Purisima EO, et al. Identification of high-quality cancer prognostic markers and metastasis network modules. Nature Communications 2010;1:34.
[39] Wang E. Understanding genomic alterations in cancer genomes using an integrative network approach. Cancer Letters 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2012.11.050 [in press].
[40] Flaberg E, Markasz L, Petranyi G, Stuber G, Dicso F, Alchihabi N, et al. High-throughput live-cell imaging reveals differential inhibition of tumor cell proliferation by human fibroblasts. International Journal of Cancer 2011;128:2793–802.
[41] Flaberg E, Guven H, Savchenko A, Pavlova T, Kashuba V, Szekely L, et al. The architecture of fibroblast monolayers of different origin differentially influences tumor cell growth. International Journal of Cancer 2012;131:2274–83.
[42] Bozóky B, Savchenko A, Csermely P, Korcsmáros T, Dúl Z, Pontén F, et al. Novel signatures of cancer-associated fibroblasts. International Journal of Cancer 2013;133:286–93.
[43] Klein G. Evolutionary aspects of cancer resistance. Seminars in Cancer Biology 2013 [in press].
[44] Cavaliere M, Sedwards S, Tarnita CE, Nowak MA, Csikász-Nagy A. Prosperity is associated with instability in dynamical networks. Journal of Theoretical Biology 2012;299:126–38.

Peter Csermely [a],[*]
Tamás Korcsmáros [b]
[a] Department of Medical Chemistry, Semmelweis University, P.O. Box 260, H-1444 Budapest 8, Hungary
[b] Department of Genetics, Eötvös Loránd University, Pázmány P. s. 1C, H-1117 Budapest, Hungary

[*] Corresponding author.
E-mail address: csermelynet@gmail.com
(P. Csermely)