Proteomics Identifies Osteomodulin as a Promoter of Breast Cancer Bone Metastasis via CDK1 Activation

Sara Cabral[1,8,*], Joseph Parsons[1,2,*], Hannah Harrison[1,8], Thomas Kedward[1,8], Paul Fullwood[2], Katherine Spence[1,8], Diane V. Lefley[3], Danielle Barden[2], Jennifer Ferguson[2], Joanne Watson[2], Kalliopi Tsafou[4], Caron Behan[5], Mark J. Dunning[6], Nisha Ali[7,8], Balázs Győrffy[9,10,11], Janet Brown[3], Michael P. Smith[2], Penelope D. Ottewell[3], Ciara S. O'Brien[1,8,12,**], Chiara Francavilla[2,8,13,**,#], Robert B. Clarke[1,8,**,#]

[1]Division of Cancer Sciences, School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Biology Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester UK

[2]Division of Cellular and Molecular Function, School of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Biology Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

[3]Division of Clinical Medicine, Medical School, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

[4]Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA

[5]Histology Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute, Manchester, UK

[6]Sheffield Bioinformatics Core, School of Medicine and Population Health, University of Sheffield, UK

[7]Manchester University Foundation Trust, Wythenshawe Hospital, Manchester, UK

[8]Manchester Breast Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

[9]Department of Bioinformatics, Semmelweis University, H-1094, Budapest, Hungary

[10]Department of Biophysics, Medical School, University of Pecs, H-7624, Pecs, Hungary

[11]Institute of Molecular Life Sciences, HUN-REN Research Centre for Natural Sciences, H-1117, Budapest, Hungary

[12]Department of Medical Oncology, Christie Hospital, Manchester, UK

[13]DTU Bioengineering, Danish Technical University, Lyndby, Denmark

*Equal Contribution

**Equal Senior Contribution

#Corresponding Authors:

Chiara Francavilla: chiafra@dtu.dk

Robert Clarke: robert.clarke@manchester.ac.uk

Keywords: breast cancer, stroma, bone metastasis, proteomics, phosphoproteomics,

osteomodulin, CDK1, CDK1 inhibitor, cancer-associated fibroblasts

Summary

Metastasis to different organs remains the main cause of mortality in breast cancer. Molecular

predictors of metastasis are limited as well as therapeutic options. Here, we conducted

quantitative proteomics and phosphoproteomics analysis of patient-derived tumours,

identifying osteomodulin (OMD) as a dysregulated protein and associated with bone

metastases. Cancer-associated fibroblasts secrete OMD which increases breast cancer

migration *in vitro* and promotes the formation of bone metastases *in vivo*. Downstream of

OMD, phosphoproteomics identified the activation of cyclin-dependent kinase 1 (CDK1). The

OMD-CDK1 signalling axis drives a pro-migratory and pro-survival phenotype *in vitro* and bone

metastasis *in vivo*. Our findings highlight the importance of OMD and CDK1 in breast cancer

bone metastasis and proposes an alternative therapeutic avenue for the treatment and the

prevention of organ-specific metastases.

Introduction

Metastases are responsible for 90% of breast cancer deaths [1] and are most commonly found in the bone, brain, liver and lungs of breast cancer patients [2]. Bone is the most prevalent site of metastasis, representing around 70% of metastatic breast cancers cases[3]. Bone metastases are characterized by being mainly osteolytic, leading to debilitating symptoms such as pathological fractures, severe bone pain, and hypercalcemia[4]. Currently, there are no clinically available biomarkers nor targeted drug therapies against organ-specific metastases in breast despite the identification of different drivers of metastatic disease[3]. Radiologically detected, or symptomatic bone metastases are typically managed with bisphosphonates and receptor activator of NF-κB ligand (RANKL) inhibitors to alleviate symptoms and reduce bone osteolysis[4]. However, there is still the need to uncover more specific biomarkers and actionable combinations of therapeutic targets for patients at risk of developing metastases. Preventing bone metastasis or targeting bone organotropic drivers would greatly benefit patients given the capacity of the bone microenvironment to condition tumour cells to colonise other organs [5-7].

Omics technologies have the capacity to provide novel biomarkers and therapeutic targets from a variety of tissues, including patient-derived samples [8]. For instance, genomic analysis of metastatic breast cancer patient samples or matched primary and metastatic breast cancer patient samples identified several potential therapeutic targets whose mutation was enriched in metastases [9]. Transcriptomic analysis of breast cancer primary and metastatic samples also identified several transcripts dysregulated in breast cancer bone metastases compared to other metastatic sites [10]. In contrast to genomics and transcriptomics, proteomics and phosphoproteomics have so far analysed primary breast cancer but not metastatic samples [11], for example identifying dysregulation in tumour cells metabolism [12], novel kinases in triple negative breast cancer patients [13], and signalling pathways associated with Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2 (HER2)-targeted therapy resistance [14].

Here, we set out to identify potential therapeutic targets and their biomarkers in breast cancer

metastasis organotropism. Fresh frozen primary breast cancer resection samples that were

clinically annotated as to the presence or absence of organ-specific metastases within 5 years

of diagnosis (distant disease-free survival at 5 years) were analysed. We combined mass

spectrometry-based proteomics and phosphoproteomics, bioinformatics, and functional

assays *in vitro* and *in vivo*. This experimental pipeline identified Osteomodulin (OMD), a

secreted member of the small leucine-rich proteoglycan family typically expressed by

osteoblasts and associated with biomineralization processes[15,16]. We demonstrated that OMD

is expressed and secreted by cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs) and stimulates the

migration of estrogen receptor-positive (ER+) and ER-negative breast cancer cells. Using

further phosphoproteomic analysis of OMD-stimulated breast cancer cells, we identified

activation of Cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK1) to be necessary for BC migration, viability and

bone metastasis. High OMD and CDK1 co-expression predicts metastatic outcome

independently of other clinical and prognostic factors in a large cohort of breast cancer with

over 15 years follow-up. Overall, this research establishes CAF-derived OMD and

downstream CDK1 signalling as important regulator of breast cancer metastasis to the bone.

Results

Proteomic Analysis of Primary Breast Cancer Samples Identifies Osteomodulin (OMD)

in Patients Developing Bone Metastases

To identify changes in proteins and phosphorylated proteins underlying breast cancer

metastasis, we analysed a cohort of 39 primary breast cancer patient samples, of which 21

developed metastases within 5 years of diagnosis (here, referred to as metastatic) while 18

were distant disease free at 5 years (here, referred to as non-metastatic), by label-free mass

spectrometry-based proteomics and phosphoproteomics (Figure 1A, Tables S1-3). Of the 39

patient samples, 21 were from patients who had hormone receptor positive (HR+) tumours, 9

who had human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 positive (HER2+) tumours and 9 who had

triple negative (TN) tumours. Our cohort included patients who developed metastases at all

four of the main metastatic sites in breast cancer at 5 years post-diagnosis (bone, brain, liver

and lung) [2], thus providing a unique dataset (Figure 1A, Table S1). We identified and quantified

a total of 6243 proteins (5106 in non-metastatic samples and 5741 in metastatic samples) and

14281 phosphorylated sites (11148 in non-metastatic samples and 13186 in metastatic

samples) (Figure S1A-B, Tables S2-3). Pearson correlation for technical replicates in the

proteomics data was above 0.95 on average and was above 0.6 on average in the

phosphoproteomics data (Figure S1C-D), thus showing high correlation. Across

phosphorylated sites, 62.8% were singly phosphorylated, 29.0% were doubly phosphorylated

and 7.2% were more than doubly phosphorylated and the residue distribution across serine,

threonine and tyrosine was 88.24%, 10.92%, 0.83%, respectively with a median score for

phosphorylated peptides of 172 (Figure S1E-G). Therefore, the quality of our proteomics and

phosphoproteomics analysis was consistent with previous publications [11,17].

We focused on proteins and phosphorylated sites present in at least 80% of either non-

metastatic or metastatic samples for further analysis (Tables S4-5). Differential expression

analysis of patients who developed or did not develop metastases identified 33 differentially

regulated proteins and 156 differentially regulated phosphorylated sites on 122 proteins (*p*

value <0.05, Log2 Fold Change in intensity >1.5) (Figure 1B-C, Tables S4-5). To determine

whether these differentially regulated proteins and phosphorylated sites had previously been

associated with breast cancer metastasis, we compared our list of 33 dysregulated proteins

and 156 dysregulated phosphorylated sites with an in-house curated database of metastasis-

associated genes and proteins obtained by searching PubMed with the term "Breast Cancer

Metastasis" for a total of 2472 entries (Table S6). We found that ADIRF, CMA1, COL11A1,

COL4A1, CTHRC1, MXRA5, OGN, OMD, SNCG, SYNM, TNC proteins and BAD, MAPK1 (2

sites), PGRMC1 (2 sites), STMN1, EIF4B and VIM phosphorylated sites have been previously

associated with breast cancer metastasis or metastasis-promoting phenotypes (Figure 1B-C,

Tables S4-6). Thus, our proteomics and phosphoproteomics analysis identified both known

and novel drivers of breast cancer metastasis.

Next, KEGG and GO enrichment analysis identified several biological processes among all

the upregulated proteins and phosphoproteins, including collagen remodelling, previously

associated with breast cancer [18] (Figure 1D, Table S7). Osteomodulin (OMD), a member of

the small leucine-rich repeat protein family[15,16], was among the upregulated proteins and

phosphorylated sites associated with collagen synthesis and remodelling. Analysis of

published datasets had previously found OMD gene expression to be correlated with breast

cancer bone metastasis[10]. In our study, OMD protein was found to be significantly higher in

patients who developed bone metastasis compared to patients who developed metastases in

other sites (*p* value = 0.0012), or that did not develop metastases (*p* value = <0.0001) (Figure

1E, Tables S1, S4). Immunohistochemical analysis of the primary tumour from the same

cohort of breast cancer samples detected OMD in 17 samples and showed heterogeneous

staining in the tumour and stromal compartments (Figure S2). Consistent with OMD protein

expression being associated with bone metastasis, we found that OMD mRNA was

significantly higher in patients developing bone metastases compared to other metastatic sites

based on three published breast cancer GEO datasets (Figure 1F) [10,19].

Overall, our proteomic and immunohistochemical analysis of primary breast cancer samples

indicates that OMD expression is higher in breast cancer patients developing bone metastasis.

OMD is Expressed by Cancer-Associated Fibroblasts and Regulates Cell Migration in

HR+ and HR- Breast Cancer

As OMD was found in the tumour and in its microenvironment (Figure S2), we first tested

whether OMD affected either cells in the tumour microenvironment or the epithelial tumour

cells themselves. We used cell models of the primary and secondary (bone) tumour

microenvironment including normal and cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs) (HMFU19 and

544R, respectively) [20,21], osteoblasts (HFOB 1.19) [22], and osteoclasts (RAW 264.7, post-

differentiation with RANKL) [23]. As a model of tumour epithelial cells, we used the epithelial

breast cancer cell line MDA-MB-231 infected with lentivirus expressing either mApple as a

control (231-mA) or an OMD-T2A linker-mApple construct (231-OMD) (Figure 2A-B). OMD

expression was confirmed by immunoblotting in cell lysates from both starvation and complete

media and in conditioned medium (CM) (Figure 2A-B), thus confirming that OMD is a secreted

protein [24]. We tested whether there were any effects on osteogenesis, a key process in the

differentiation and turnover of bone tissues involved in sclerotic metastases [25], by assessing

Alkaline Phosphatase Activity and calcium deposition via Alizarin Red staining. To mimic

secreted OMD, we used recombinant OMD (rOMD) at increasing concentrations from 10ng/ml

to 1µg/ml, which recapitulates the concentrations used by others[26]. Both osteogenesis and

calcium deposition were significantly induced in the osteoblast cells upon differentiation

(Figure S3A-C). However, compared to differentiated osteoblasts, alkaline phosphatase

activity is unaffected by conditioned medium (CM) from 231-mA or 231-OMD or by increasing

concentrations of rOMD, except for the highest concentration of rOMD which induces calcium

deposition. Additionally, in the bone-resorbing osteoclasts, no significant induction of activity

was seen upon treatment of osteoclasts with either CM from 231-mA and from 231-OMD cells

or rOMD was observed, as the number and size of pores was consistent across all conditions

(Figure 2A-B, Figure S3D-G). Collagen contractility was also assessed to understand whether

OMD affects matrix remodelling in normal fibroblasts, CAFs and differentiated osteoblasts.

rOMD and CM derived from 231-OMD and 231-mA cells had no effect on the collagen

remodelling capabilities of each of the tested cells (Figure S3H-J).

Using 231-OMD cells, we next tested whether OMD expression affected the behaviour of

breast cancer cells. We assessed behaviour by looking at effects on extracellular matrix

remodelling, proliferation and stemness of breast cancer cells by conducting collagen

contractility assays, measuring EdU incorporation, and mammosphere formation and self-

renewal assays, respectively. We found that OMD overexpression had no effects on any of

these behaviours (Figure S4A-D). We next assessed the effects of OMD on cell migration

using a scratch wound assay and cell invasion using a Boyden chamber assay. Although invasion was not significantly altered between 231-mA and 231-OMD cells in our experimental conditions, OMD expression significantly increased cell migration (Figure 3C-D, Figure S4E). Additionally, treatment with increasing concentrations of rOMD significantly induced 231-mA cell migration in a dose-dependent manner (Figure 3C-D). We also tested the effect of rOMD on the migration of ER+ MCF-7 cell line (Fig 3F-G), and confirmed that the highest concentration of rOMD increased MCF-7 migration. However, OMD expression did not affect cell motility of the bone-tropic MDA-MB-231 (231-Bo) cell line [27]. Indeed, cell migration of the bone-tropic MDA-MB-231 cell line expressing OMD (231-Bo OMD) was similar to control cells (231-Bo) (Figure S4F-I).

Based on the pattern of OMD staining in our cohort (Figure S2) and to determine which cells in the tumour microenvironment were expressing OMD, we analysed available breast cancer single cell RNAseq expression data including both stromal and epithelial cells[28]. We found that CAFs but not other stromal cells consistently expressed OMD, and not epithelial cells as previously hypothesized (Figure 3A-B). To further confirm OMD expression in the stroma, we stained a tissue microarray of 482 breast cancer patient samples[29]. OMD staining was detected only in stromal areas and not in tumour epithelium (Figure S5). The single cell RNAseq and immunostaining analyses establish that OMD gene and protein are expressed in CAFs. To validate this, we proceeded to collect CAF CM from our selected CAF cell line 544R. Using ELISA, we showed that CAF CM contained 45 ng/mL OMD while the 231-OMD CM contained 96 ng/mL (Figure 3C). The CAF CM stimulated both 231-mA and MCF-7 cell migration similarly to what we observed by adding rOMD (Figure 3D-G) and in line with previous results (Figure 2). Overall, we established that OMD increases cell migration in ER+ and ER- breast cancer and is secreted in the tumour microenvironment by CAFs, suggesting that fibroblasts play a role in inducing breast cancer metastasis to the bone.

Phosphoproteomics Identifies an OMD-CDK1 Axis Driving Cell Migration and Viability

To ascertain the mechanism underlying the role of OMD in breast cancer cell migration, we

analysed changes in the proteome and phosphoproteome of 231-OMD cells compared to 231-

mA (Figure 4, Figure S6). 231-Bo and 231-Bo OMD cells were used as further controls. We

identified and quantified 3971 proteins and 9423 phosphorylated sites (Tables S8-9). Pearson

correlation between biological replicates of the proteomic and phosphoproteomic data were

consistently over 0.97 and 0.6 respectively (Figure S6B-C). Across phosphorylated peptides,

41.9% were singly phosphorylated, 47.6% were doubly phosphorylated, and 10.5% were more

than doubly phosphorylated and the distribution of phosphorylated site residue across serine,

threonine and tyrosine was 85%, 11.3% and 3.7%, respectively, indicating enrichment on

tyrosine residues, with a median phosphorylated peptide score of 182 (Figure S6D-F). All the

quality controls were in line with previous publications [11,17]. Differential expression analysis

showed no differences between proteins expressed by 231-OMD and 231-mA (P < 0.05, Log2

Fold change > 1, Table S10) but identified 53 distinct phosphorylation sites, of which 18 were

upregulated and 35 were downregulated (Fig. 4A, Table S11). Of the 18 sites specifically

phosphorylated at higher levels in 231-OMD compared to 231-mA cells, only FOS like 1

(FOSL1) phosphorylation on serine 26 has a known cancer-associated function according to

Phosphosite plus [30] and has been shown to promote migration in MCF-7 breast cancer cells

[31]. Of the 35 downregulated phosphorylated sites in 231-OMD compared to 231-mA cells, 5

were also downregulated in 231-Bo OMD compared to 231-Bo cells, suggesting that these

sites are unlikely associated with the 231-OMD pro-migratory signalling mechanism and thus

they were excluded from further analysis (Table S11). Of the remaining 30 phosphorylated

sites specifically downregulated in 231-OMD compared to 231-mA cells, 6 had metastasis-

associated functions, such as promoting cell migration, invasion, or drug resistance according

to Phosphosite plus [30] (Figure 4A). Only one of these 30 downregulated sites was associated

with inactivation of protein activity which was Tyrosine 15 (Y15) on the cell cycle regulator,

Cyclin-dependent kinase 1 (CDK1, CDC2) [32] (Figure 4A, Table S11). We confirmed the

downregulation of Y15 on CDK1 in 231-OMD compared to 231-mA, 231-Bo OMD, and 231-

Bo cells by quantified immunoblotting (Figure 4B-C). Next, we searched for evidence of the

OMD-CDK1 crosstalk in available phosphoproteomics datasets analysing breast cancer patient samples. We found an inverse relationship between OMD expression and reduction of CDK1 inhibitory phosphorylation in two independent phosphoproteomics datasets analysing 105 and 122 breast cancer patients, respectively [11,33]. In these phosphoproteomics analyses, CDK1 inhibitory phosphorylation at Y15 [32] was significantly reduced in patients where OMD expression was above the mean compared to patients where OMD expression was below the mean (Figure 4D-E). Therefore, the OMD-CDK1 axis may regulate the function of OMD.

To investigate the contribution of OMD and CDK1 to breast cancer metastasis, we analysed 2,765 breast cancer cases from KM Plotter[34]. We investigated high expression (n = 1697) versus low expression (n = 1068) of both OMD and CDK1 using optimal cutoff over a follow-up period of 180 months. The hazard ratio (HR) of high versus low expression was 1.63, indicating a higher risk of recurrence in patients with high expression of OMD and CDK1 (Figure 4F). For ER+ patients, we investigated distant metastasis-free survival (DMFS) for high versus low expression and revealed a hazard ratio (HR) of 1.81, demonstrating a higher risk of relapse for patients with this subtype (Figure 4G). We further analysed the data to ensure that OMD and CDK1 were independent prognostic factors (Table S12). In the analysis of all tumors, the signature demonstrated independent prognostic value for DMFS, with a p value of 0.045. In ER+ tumors, the signature showed strong prognostic performance, with a p value of 1.1×10^{-4}. It surpassed all clinical parameters, including HER2 expression ($p = 0.055$), lymph node status ($p = 0.104$), tumor grade ($p = 0.025$), tumor size ($p = 0.0002$), and patient age ($p = 0.552$). These findings underscore the independent prognostic impact of the signature, with its strongest predictive value observed in ER+ breast cancer cases (Figure 4G). Overall, the analysis found higher OMD/CDK1 to be a strong indicator of recurrence independent of other prognostic variables, especially in ER+ patients, 20-40% of whom experience metastasis and 70% of these correspond to bone.

CDK1 Regulates Cell Migration and Viability *in vitro*

To verify the role of CDK1 downstream of OMD, we inhibited CDK1 using 10μM of the CDK1

inhibitor (CDK1i) RO-3306 [35] and assessed cell migration in the 231-mA and 231-OMD cells.

As expected, 231-OMD cells migrate more than 231-mA cells. However, only in 231-OMD was

cell migration significantly reduced upon treatment with 10μM RO-3306 (Figure 5A). To test

whether this reduction in migration was specifically downstream of CDK1, we inhibited CDK4/6

with 10μM of the clinically relevant inhibitor Palbociclib (CDK4/6i) and showed that its inhibition

did not significantly reduce 231-OMD cell migration (Figure 5A). Next, we investigated the

ability of CDK1 inhibition to block rOMD or CAF-derived CM in both ER+ and ER- cells. We

confirmed increased migration in response to rOMD which was effectively abrogated by RO-

3306 in both 231-mA and MCF-7 cells (Figs. 5B-C). The increased migration observed after

incubation with CAF-derived CM was also blocked by the CDK1i in both ER+ and ER- cell

lines (Figure 5D). Therefore, CDK1 is specifically activated in breast epithelial cells to regulate

cell migration *in vitro* and its inhibition decreases migration in response to OMD.

Given the known role of CDK1 in regulating cell cycle and cell viability [32], we studied the effect

of CDK1 inhibition on cell viability in both ER+ and ER- cells. We performed an Alamar blue

assay [36] on 231-mA, 231-OMD, and MCF-7 cell models and found that CDK1 inhibition only

reduced the viability of 231-OMD and MCF-7 cells treated with rOMD, but not 231-mA (Figs.

5E-F).

Finally, to test the clinical relevance of the OMD-CDK1 signalling axis, we used patient breast

cancer cells derived from metastatic pleural effusions and ascitic fluids (Figure 5G, Figure

S7A). Firstly, we assessed the effect of CDK1 activity on the viability of 5 metastatic patient-

derived breast cancers *in vitro*, of which 4 showed decreased cell viability in response to CDK1

inhibition (Figure S7B). Phosphoproteomics and proteomics analysis of these samples

produced a high-quality dataset (Figure S7C-G, Tables S13-14) and identified the

downregulation of Y15 on CDK1 in the 4 samples that responded to CDK1 inhibition and

reduced CDK1 Y15 phosphorylation significantly correlated with reduced viability in response

to 10μM RO-3306 treatment (Figure S7B, S7H, Table S14). Next, we studied 6 ER/PR positive

samples from ascites that had bone metastasis at the time of collection, 3 of which had

amplification of HER2 (Figure 5G). The ascitic fluid containing the breast cancer cells

expressed OMD at concentrations ranging from 30 to 1100 ng/mL (Figure 5H). We tested

CDK1 Y15 phosphorylation in the breast cancer cells derived from the ascitic fluid and

demonstrated low or no detectable phosphorylation, suggesting high activity of CDK1[37] (Figure

5I). We also assessed cell viability of these samples upon treatment with the CDK1 inhibitor

RO-3306 which demonstrated that 5 out of 6 samples responded (Figure 5J). The sample that

did not respond (BB3RC50) was the only sample where CDK1 Y15 phosphorylation was

evident by immunoblotting (Figure 5I). These data highlight the crucial role of active CDK1

downstream of OMD in regulating the viability of patient-derived breast cancer samples,

including those with bone metastases at the time of collection (Figure 5G).

Overall, these results indicate a mechanistic role for CDK1 downstream of OMD secreted from

fibroblasts in cellular processes relevant to metastasis such as cell migration and cell survival,

including in breast cancer cells derived from patients with bone metastases.

OMD-CDK1 Axis Drives Bone Metastasis and Bone Colonization *in vivo*

Next, we assessed the effect of OMD on metastatic potential *in vivo*. To do this, we injected

231-mA, 231-OMD, and 231-BO (positive control for bone metastases) cells by intracardiac

injection into four athymic nude mice (Figure 6Ai). We found no significant differences in the

lung metastatic potential of 231-mA, 231-OMD, and 231-BO cells (Figure 6B). However, in

femoral bone flushes, the number of cytokeratin 19 (CK19)-positive cells, which is a marker

for human epithelial cells [27], was significantly higher in 231-OMD compared to 231-mA (Figure

6C-D). As expected, the bone-tropic 231-Bo also colonized the bone. This finding confirms a

role for OMD in the colonization of bone by breast cancer cells *in vivo*.

Since CDK1 regulates cell migration and viability in 231-OMD cells, we next tested whether

the OMD-CDK1 axis regulated bone colonization *in vivo.* To do this, we performed intracardiac

injection of 231-OMD cells into four athymic nude mice and tested whether inhibition of CDK1

affected the formation of bone metastasis (Figure 6Aii). We detected numerous CK19-positive

cells in bone flushes of mice treated with the vehicle control but almost no CK19-positive cells

in those treated with the CDK1 inhibitor RO-3306 (Figure 6E-F). Altogether, these *in vivo* data

indicate a role for the OMD-CDK1 axis in bone colonization by breast cancer cells*.*

In conclusion, we combined quantitative proteomics and phosphoproteomics from cancer

patients with bioinformatics analysis and functional assays *in vitro* and *in vivo* and showed that

OMD derived from CAFs regulates cell migration, cell viability and bone metastatic capabilities

through a CDK1-dependent mechanism.

Discussion

The yet unmet clinical need for novel biomarkers and targeted therapies to prevent and treat

breast cancer metastasis is demonstrated by the still very high number of deaths from breast

cancer each year of which 90% is caused by metastatic disease [2]. Here, we combined

quantitative proteomics and phosphoproteomics from breast cancer patient-derived samples

and cell models with bioinformatics analysis and functional assays *in vitro* and *in vivo*. We

demonstrated that OMD is expressed and secreted by cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs)

and stimulates the migration of ER-positive and ER-negative breast cancer cells. We found

that OMD requires the activation of CDK1 to regulate BC cell migration and cell viability and

to promote bone metastasis *in vivo*.

Our study establishes that proteomics and phosphoproteomics of patient samples with known

outcome at 5 years will identify novel drivers of metastasis. This time period was selected

based on the available clinical outcome data. The aim was to derive proteins that could be

used as biomarkers or drug targets in the clinic, as dysregulated genes or RNA transcripts

identified in patient samples poorly correlate with the proteomics changes seen in metastases

[8,33]. Among the limitations of proteomics analysis of large cohort of patient samples are the

availability of fresh frozen rather than paraffin-embedded (not yet suitable for

phosphoproteomics) matched primary and metastatic samples and of the clinical information

associated with them. Our proteomics and phosphoproteomics analysis of fresh frozen

primary breast cancer resection samples provides therefore a unique resource as samples

were manually annotated to determine the presence or absence of organ-specific metastases

within five years of diagnosis [38,39]. More recent approaches, including spatial proteomics[40] and

single-cell proteomics[41] analysis of large cohort of clinical samples, will enable further

discoveries in the near future.

Our proteomics analysis identified OMD, a monomeric member of the small leucine-rich repeat

protein (SLRP) family [42], as significantly upregulated in patients who developed bone

metastases compared to those who developed metastases at other metastatic sites or who

did not develop metastases. The transcript of OMD was previously identified as enriched in

breast cancer bone metastases compared to breast cancer metastases in other organs [10] and

in prostate cancer bone metastases [19]. These findings suggest that OMD may be a pan-cancer

biomarker for bone metastases. OMD regulates important cancer pathways, including Ras,

P53, Jun/Fos, MYC, and NFκB signalling [24] but little is known about its role in cancer

phenotypes. Although our data exclude a primary role for OMD in the tested functions of

fibroblasts and osteoclasts using available cell models, OMD may play a role in promoting

bone turnover, which is an essential step in osteosclerotic bone metastases [25]. OMD is known

to reduce apoptosis in osteoblasts [43], thus supporting a role for OMD in promoting new bone

formation and cell survival. Indeed, in our patient cohort upregulated OMD expression

correlates with upregulation of serine 118 phosphorylation on pro-apoptotic protein BCL2-

associated agonist of cell death (BAD) (Table S5). This site prevents BAD interaction with

BCL2 Like 1, thus preventing apoptosis [44]. We establish here that OMD regulates cell

migration in both ER+ and ER- cell lines and that secretion of OMD is from CAFs, not tumour

cells. We validate this by showing that CAFs secrete biologically relevant concentrations of

OMD[45], which stimulate tumour cell migration. In support of this mechanism, recent data

demonstrate cancer-associated fibroblasts are strongly associated with bone metastasis in

over 300 early invasive ductal breast cancer patients [46].

Secreted OMD [24] engages cell surface receptors, such as the BMP2 receptor complex [45], and

integrin $\alpha_V\beta_3$, both of which are associated with bone metastasis [47,48]. In support of this idea,

we identified BMP2-induced kinase (BMP2K) and FAK activity downstream of OMD (Table

S11 and data not shown). Crosslinking[49] and cell-surface capture mass spectrometry[50], or

functional kinase profiling assays could be used to identify other candidates and elucidate the

signalling pathways downstream of OMD in breast and other cancer cells. Phosphoproteomics

analysis identified a correlation between elevated OMD expression and increased activation

of the kinase CDK1 in both cell models and patient samples. Therefore, OMD expression may

inform clinicians as to which patients could benefit from CDK1 inhibition. Indeed, we

demonstrated the independent prognostic impact of a OMD/CDK1 signature on metastatic

recurrence in over 2,600 breast cancer patients, with the strongest predictive value observed

in ER+ cases. This would require further validation at the protein level to develop an effective

biomarker to select for OMD/CDK1 therapy to prevent bone metastasis.

Osteoblasts express and secrete OMD[51,52], and it is therefore feasible that when cancer cells

arrive in the bone microenvironment, osteoblast-secreted OMD enables cancer cell

colonisation. Furthermore, CDK1 phosphorylates and activates RUNX2, which can induce a

variety of bone-related genes [53,54], and we speculate that OMD may drive bone metastasis

through CDK1-RUNX2 [55,56].

We validated that the OMD-CDK1 axis is a driver of cell viability and motility, consistent with

the role of CDK1 not only in cell cycle regulation, but also in actin remodelling, a key process

in cell migration [57]. We also found increased phosphorylation of vimentin on Serine 56 (Table

S5), which regulates cancer cell invasion [58], in patients who developed metastases compared

to those who did not (Table S5). The intriguing role of CDK1 as a driver of cell migration and

potential metastasis deserves further investigation in breast and other cancers. Indeed, CDK1

mRNA is upregulated not only in several transcriptomics datasets of breast cancer samples

compared to normal breast tissue samples [59], but also in melanoma [60], thyroid cancer [61] and

acute myeloid leukaemia [20]. Additionally, our study investigating tumour cells derived from

patients with bone metastases showed a relationship between OMD protein expression, CDK1

activation (reduced Y15 phosphorylation) and reduced cell viability in response to CDK1

inhibitor. As discussed above, OMD may activate BAD to drive the survival of breast cancer

patient cells during bone metastasis. Finally, we demonstrate higher bone colonisation after

intracardiac injection of OMD-overexpressing tumour cells and that this can be abrogated by

treatment with a CDK1 inhibitor. Overall, our data suggest that CDK inhibition could serve as

a novel therapeutic route to decrease motility, viability and bone metastasis in breast cancer.

However, the CDK1 inhibitor RO-3306 has been used in few studies *in vivo* [62,63] and no CDK1-

selective inhibitor has been tested in clinical trials in breast or other cancers [64]. Future studies

should aim at testing other CDK1-selective inhibitors or CDK1 inhibition in combination with

other signalling inhibitors. For instance, among the phosphorylated sites significantly

upregulated in patients who developed metastases compared to those who did not, we also

found phosphorylated ser 641 on catenin alpha 1 (CTNNA1) (Table S5) which activates beta

catenin signalling resulting in tumour cell invasion [65] and phosphorylated Thr185/Tyr187 on

MAPK1 which are hyperactive in metastatic TNBC [13] (Table S5). Therefore, our data provides

the rationale for the targeting of MAPK and beta catenin signalling pathways in combination

with or independently of CDK1 inhibition to prevent metastasis.

In conclusion, the identification of the OMD-CDK1 axis from patient-derived samples with

complete clinical information suggests that similar studies can be performed in any cancer

setting including across multiple cancers to identify novel biomarkers, organotropic metastatic

drivers, and therapeutic targets. Here, OMD was discovered to be significantly upregulated in

primary breast cancer biopsies of patients who developed bone metastases within five years

of diagnosis, compared to those who were distant disease free at 5 years. OMD significantly

increased cell migration and cell viability as well as bone colonisation of breast cancer cells

and of breast cancer cells derived from patients with bone metastases. Migration, viability and

bone colonisation induced by CAF-derived OMD were CDK1-dependent and thus highlight a

key tumour-stroma interaction in bone metastasis establishing the OMD–CDK1 axis as a

potential therapeutic target in metastatic breast cancer.

Resource Availability

Data and code availability

Acknowledgments

Funding: This work was supported by Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council

grant EP/S022201/1 (SC), CR-UK Non-Clinical Training Award A27445 (JP), Medical

Research Council grant MR/T016043/1 (PF, DB, JF, MPS, JW), Breast Cancer Now (HH, KS,

PO, DL), Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research at Broad Institute (KT), NIHR Manchester

Biomedical Research Centre (TK, NA), Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute Histology

Core Facility (CB), Yorkshire Cancer Research, Western Park Cancer Charity (PO), National

Institute for Health Research (COB), Cancer Research UK, National Institute for Health

Research, UK Research and Innovation, Breast Cancer Now (RBC), Wellcome Trust 107636/

Z/15/Z and 107636/Z/15/A, the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council

BB/X001970/1 and Medical Research Council MR/T016043/1, the NNF Young Investigator

Award call 2022, NNF22OC0070845 (CF). For the purpose of open access, the author has

applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising

from this submission.

We thank the CRUK Manchester Institute Histology and Visualisation, Imaging and Analysis

facilities for their support with immunohistochemical optimisation and visualisation, the

University of Manchester Bio-MS, Genome Editing, and Imaging facilities for their continuing

support throughout the project. We thank Dr Hurlstone, University of Manchester for providing

invaluable reagents and protocols.

Author contributions. S.C., J.P. performed the research and interpreted data. H.H., T.K.,

P.F., K.S., D.B., J.F., J.F., C.B., N.A., M.P.S, P.O., D.L., J.B. contributed to the research and

interpreted data. J.W., K.T., M.J.D., B.G. supported and contributed to the bioinformatic

analyses. C.O.B. devised and supervised the project and collated information on patient

samples for mass spectrometry-based analysis. CF devised and supervised the project,

designed mass spectrometry and *in vitro* experiments, and obtained funding for the project.

RBC devised and supervised the project, designed *in vitro* and *in vivo* experiments, and

obtained funding for the project. All authors reviewed and approved the manuscript before

submission.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest. All authors give consent for publication.

STAR Methods

Key Resources Table

Consumables	
Covaris microtube-500 AFA Fiber Screw Cap (520185)	Covaris
Sep-Pak Classic C18 Cartridges (WAT051910)	Waters
Solid Phase Extraction Disk "EMPORE" C18 3M (2315)	Agilent Technologies
Solid Phase Extraction Disk "EMPORE" C8 3M (2314)	Agilent Technologies
Cells	
MDA-MB-231 Parental Cells	Gift from Joan Massagué[27,66]
MDA-MB-231 Bone-Tropic Cells	Gift from Joan Massagué[27,66]
MCF-7	ATCC
HMFU19 Immortalised Normal Fibroblasts	Gift from Cliona Kirwan[67]
544R Immortalised Cancer-Associated Fibroblasts	Gift from Cliona Kirwan[68]
HFOB 1.19 (CRL-11372)	ATCC
RAW 264.7 Mouse Monocytes	Gift from Penny Ottewell[69]
Lenti-X 293T	Gift from Adam Hurlstone[70]

XL1 Blue *E.coli* (200249)	Agilent
Kits	
ReliaPrep™ RNA Cell MiniPrep System (Z6011)	Promega
GoScript™ Reverse Transcription System (A5001)	Promega
Click-iT™ EdU Cell Proliferation Kit for Imaging, Alexa Fluor™ 488 dye (C10337)	ThermoFisher
Alkaline Phosphatase Assay Kit (ab83368)	Abcam
VenorGem Classic Mycoplasma Detection Kit (11-1025)	Minerva Biolabs
QIAquick Gel Extraction Kit (28706X4)	Qiagen
QIAPrep Spin Miniprep Kit (27106X4)	Qiagen
Human Osteoadherin/Osteomodulin PharmaGenie ELISA Kit (SBRS0954)	AssayGenie
Pierce™ BCA Protein Assay Kit (23225)	ThermoFisher
Reagents	
Bicinchoninic Acid Solution (B9643-1L)	Merck
Copper (II) Sulfate Solution (C2284)	Merck
Trypsin Porcine Pancreas (T6567)	Sigma-Aldrich

Lysyl Endopeptidase/Endopeptidase C (12505061)	Fujifilm
Trifluoroacetic Acid (76-05-1)	Sigma-Aldrich
Acetonitrile (75-05-8)	Merck
Titanium Dioxide Beads "Titanspheres" (5020-75000)	GL Sciences
Formic Acid (64-18-6)	Merck
Stable Cell DMEM (0819)	Sigma-Aldrich
RPMI (R0883)	Sigma-Aldrich
DMEM-F12 (31330-038)	Gibco
DMEM-F12 no phenol red (21041025)	Gibco
Advanced DMEM/F12 (12634)	Gibco
B27 Supplement (12587-010)	Gibco
Epidermal Growth Factor (E9644)	Sigma-Aldrich
Hydrocortisone (H0888)	Merck
L-Glutamine (25030081)	ThermoFisher
Poly(2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate)/polyHEMA (P3932)	Merck
Phosphate Buffered Saline 1X (D8662)	Sigma-Aldrich
Trypsin-EDTA 0.05% (T3924)	Sigma-Aldrich

Penicillin-Streptomycin (P0781)	Sigma-Aldrich
Sodium Pyruvate (S8636)	Sigma-Aldrich
Foetal Calf Serum Qualified (10270106)	Gibco
Recombinant Human RANKL (390-TN)	Biotechne (RND Systems)
Recombinant Human OMD (10825-H08H)	SinoBiological
FuGENE HD Transfection Reagent (E2311)	Promega
VSV-G Envelope expressing plasmid pMD2.G	Gift from Adam Hurlstone[70]
pMDLg/pRRE Lentiviral Packaging Plasmid	Gift from Adam Hurlstone[70]
pRSV-Rev Lentiviral Packaging Plasmid	Gift from Adam Hurlstone[70]
NotI Restriction Enzyme (R3189S)	New England Biolabs
NheI Restriction Enzyme (R3131S)	New England Biolabs
CIP (Calf Intestinal Alkaline Phosphatase) (M0290S)	New England Biolabs
T4 Ligase (M0202S)	New England Biolabs
qPCRBIO SyGreen Mix (PB20.14-05)	PCR Biosystems
Clarity Western ECL Substrate (1705061)	Bio-rad
Mitomycin (10022604)	Fisher Scientific
RO-3306 (217699)	Sigma-Aldrich
Palbociclib (S1116)	Selleck

Haemotoxylin (6765008)	Epredia
Eosin Y Alcoholic (6766008)	Epredia
Neutral Buffered Formalin 4%	Genta Medical
Triton x-100 (X100)	Sigma-Aldrich
Dako pH9 Antigen Retrieval Solution (S2367)	DAKO
Hydrogen Peroxide 30% solution (H1009)	Sigma-Aldrich
Casein 10X (SP5020)	Vector Labs
Mouse-on-Mouse Detection Kit (MP2400)	Vector Labs
ARK (Animal Research Kit) (K3954)	DAKO
Avidin/Biotin Blocking Kit (SP2001)	Vector Labs
Hoechst 3342 (4082S)	New England Biolabs
Bovine Serum Albumin (A30075)	Melford
PureCol Type I Bovine Collagen Solution (5005)	Advanced Biomatrix
Matrigel (354234)	Corning
Crystal Violet (C0775)	Sigma-Aldrich
Alizarin Red (A5533)	Sigma-Aldrich
Toluidine Blue (T3260)	Sigma-Aldrich
0.4mm Bovine Cortical Bone Slices	Boneslices.com

Alamar Blue Reagent (DAL1025)	ThermoFisher
Antibodies Antibodies were diluted 1:1000 for immunoblotting and 1:100 for immunohistochemistry except Vinculin and GAPDH loading controls which were using in immunoblotting at 1:10000 and OMD for immunohistochemistry which was used at 1:50. Antibodies were validated for the species and application on the manufacturer's websites.	
Anti-Phospho-Tyrosine Mouse Antibody – Sepharose Bead Conjugate (9419)	Cell Signalling
PTMScan(R) Tyr Motif IAP Beads (1991S)	Cell Signalling
PTMScan Phospho-tyrosine Rabbit Antibody (P-Tyr-1000) (8803)	Cell Signalling
Anti-Osteomodulin Polyclonal Rabbit Antibody (NBP2-19626)	Novus Biologicals
Anti-Vinculin Mouse Monoclonal Antibody (V9624)	Sigma-Aldrich
Anti-T2A Mouse Monoclonal Anitbody (NBP2-59627)	Novus Biologicals
Anti-Cytokeratin 19 Antibody (MO888)	DAKO
Anti-cytokeratin 19 antibody (M8888) used in Fig 5C-D	Agilent
Anti-phosphorylated CDK1 (Y15) Rabbit Polyclonal Antibody (A14600)	Abclonal

Anti-CDK1 Rabbit Polyclonal Antibody (131450)	Abcam	
Vectors		
pCDH1-Ef1-MCS-T2A-mApple vector	University of Manchester[70]	
Primers		
Beta Actin: Fwd TGGAACGGTGAAGGTGACAG Rev AACAACGCATCTCATATTTGGAA	In-house	
RANKL: Fwd CAACATATCGTTGGATCACAGCA Rev GACAGACTCACTTTATGGGAACC	In-house	
IBSP: Fwd CACTGGAGCCAATGCAGAAGA Rev TGGTGGGGTTGTAGGTTCAAA	In-house	
SPARC: Fwd TGAGGTATCTGTGGGAGCTAATC Rev CCTTGCCGTGTTTGCAGTG	In-house	
CDH11: Fwd AGAGAGCCCATACACGTTGA Rev TTGGCATGATAGGTCTCGTGC	In-house	
Mouse Beta Actin: Fwd GGCTGTATTCCCCTCCAT Rev CCAGTTGGTAACAATGCCATGT	In-house	

Mouse CTSK: Fwd AATACCTCCCTCTCGATCCTACA Rev TGGTTGTTGACTGGAGTAACGTA	In-house
Mouse OSCAR: Fwd CCGTGCTGACTTCACACCAA Rev GGGGTGACAAGGCCACTTTT	In-house
Software	
MaxQuant version 1.5.6.5	[71]
Perseus version 1.6.10.45	[72]
STRING version 11.5	[73]
Cytoscape version 3.4.0	[74]
R Framework version 4.2.1	http://www.rstudio.com/
RStudio version 2022.02.3	http://www.rstudio.com/
OlyVIA	Olympus LifeScience
ImageJ version 1.52	[75]
SkanIt version 6.1	ThermoFisher
QuPath version 0.2.3	[76]

Ethics approval

Early breast cancer samples were collected from patients undergoing surgical resection of the

primary tumour at the Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust through the Manchester

Cancer Research Centre Biobank. Metastatic fluids (ascites or pleural effusions) drained from

advanced breast cancer patients were collected at the Christie and South Manchester

Hospitals NHS Foundation Trusts through the Manchester Cancer Research Centre Biobank.

Fully informed consent from all patients was obtained in accordance with local National

Research Ethics Service guidelines (study numbers: 05/ Q1402/25, 05/Q1403/159, and

12/ROCL/01). Patient samples from the University of Sheffield sponsored AZURE trial

were obtained with fully informed patient consent. AZURE was approved by the Clinical Trials

Committee; controlled trials number ISRCTN79831382[29].

***In vivo* Experiments**

All *in vivo* experiments were performed in accordance with the Animals (Scientific Procedures)

Act 1986 under the UK Home Office project licence PCFEAC0D4 and study protocols were

approved by the CRUK Manchester Institute Animal Welfare and Ethical Research Board

(AWERB). 100,000 PAM, PAO, or BOM cells in 50µl PBS were injected into the left cardiac

ventricle of 4 athymic nude mice (sourced from Envigo) per condition using a 28-gauge needle.

Mice were monitored for 25 days before culling. For CDK1 inhibition studies, 4 days after

intracardiac injection of 100,000 PAO cells, 4 athymic nude mice were dosed with 225µl of

RO-3306 solution (final concentration 4mg/kg, SeleckChem) dissolved in 40% PEG300-1%

Tween80-3% DMSO in ddH$_2$O given 3 times per week by oral gavage and compared to 4

vehicle control mice. Mice were culled 25 days after intracardiac injection of breast cancer

cells. Lungs (only for the first study) and one femur were formalin-fixed for

immunohistochemical analysis, and one femur was collected in DMEM with FCS, 10% Pen-

Strep and 1mM Sodium pyruvate and bones were flushed. To flush bones, the ends of mouse

femurs were clipped using scissors and ground down and the bone marrow was flushed using

5mL complete DMEM using a 25-gauge needle. The ground bone ends and bone marrow

were filtered through a 100µm filter which was washed with 5mL complete DMEM. Filtered

bone cells were pelleted by centrifugation at 600xg at 4°C before filtering through a 40µm

filter.

Sample Preparation for Proteomics and Phosphoproteomics

Fresh frozen primary breast cancer patient samples were ground using a pestle and a mortar filled with liquid nitrogen to prevent tissue thawing. Technical replicates of 9 samples were used to assess reproducibility of the method. For both fresh frozen primary breast cancer patient samples and metastatic effusion samples, 6M guanidine hydrochloride in 100mM Tris pH 8.5 at 99°C was immediately added to the ground tissue and samples were heated at 99 degrees for 10 minutes in an Eppendorf shaker at 600rpm. Lysates were transferred to Covaris sonicator tubes and sonicated in a Covaris E220 (Covaris) three times for three minutes cycles with peak power of 500, duty factor 30%, 200 cycles/burst and 150 average power. Protein concentration was assessed using bicinchoninic acid assay (ThermoFisher). 750ug of protein was digested to peptides using Endopeptidase C for 1 hour before dilution with 25mM Tris pH 8.5 and further digestion with trypsin overnight. Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) was added to 1% concentration to eliminate further trypsin activity. Samples were desalted using SepPak columns (Waters), eluted using 50% acetonitrile (ACN) dried using an Eppendorf Concentrator, resuspended in 10mM ammonium hydroxide (NH_4OH) pH 10 and fractionated using a StageTip-based reverse phase fractionation method. StageTips were initially activated with methanol, 5mM NH_4OH 50% ACN and 10mM NH_4OH before loading samples, taking a flow-through fraction, and subsequently eluting with 1% ACN and 7% ACN into different fractions. A 50% ACN fraction is taken to remove any remaining peptides bound to the C18 disks. The same fractionation with a flow-through, 1%, 7% and 50% ACN fraction was performed on a second tip. The flow through and 50% fractions were combined, both 1% fractions were combined and both 7% fractions were combined. 5% of each sample was retained for proteome analysis. The remaining 95% was acidified with 6% TFA in 50% ACN before incubation with titanium dioxide coated beads (GL Sciences) in 20mg/ml dihydroxybenzoic acid (DHB) resuspended in 80% ACN, 6% TFA and deionised water, as previously described[17]. Beads were centrifuged onto a C8 disc (EMPORE) and then were washed with 10% ACN 6% TFA followed by 40% ACN 6% TFA and 80% ACN 6% TFA before

subsequently being eluted using 5% ammonia and 10% ammonia in 25% ACN. Both proteome

and phosphoproteome samples were loaded onto C18 StageTips (EMPORE) for an additional

desalting step before elution using 40% ACN. Samples were then reduced to 5ul using an

Eppendorf Concentrator and resuspended in 25ul 0.1% Formic Acid, 5% TFA before analysis

on the mass spectrometer.

MDA-MB-231 cells (three independent biological replicates of 231-mA, 231-OMD, 231-Bo and

231-Bo OMD) were lysed with 6M GuHCl in 100mM Tris pH 8.5 heated to 99°C. Lysates were

sonicated and protein concentration assessed as above. 1.5mg of protein per sample was

digested and desalted as above. Dried samples were resuspended in 50mM MOPS pH 7.2,

10mM Sodium Phosphate, 50mM Sodium Chloride (NaCl) and dissolved overnight. Samples

were clarified by centrifugation and clarified peptides were incubated in a new tube with

immobilised phosphorylated tyrosine antibody beads (Cell Signalling) and incubated for 2

hours at 4°C. Beads were washed five times with the MOPS buffer and twice with 50mM NaCl.

Phosphorylated tyrosine-enriched peptides were eluted from the beads three times using

0.1% TFA. Unbound samples were processed as above with 5% of sample retained for

proteome analysis and the rest being used for phosphorylated peptide enrichment. Proteome,

phosphoproteome and phosphorylated tyrosine-enriched samples were loaded onto C18

StageTips, eluted using 40% ACN, reduced to 5ul and resuspended in 0.1% Formic acid, 5%

TFA before analysis on the mass spectrometer.

Cells from metastatic effusions were pelleted by centrifugation, the supernatant was removed,

and cells were lysed and processed for proteomic analysis via the same processes as

MDAMB231 cell lines, described above.

Mass Spectrometry Analysis

Mass spectrometry analysis was performed as described[17]. Briefly, purified peptides were

analysed by LC-MS/MS using an UltiMate 3000 Rapid Separation LC (ThermoFisher) coupled

to an Orbitrap Exploris 480 mass spectrometer (ThermoFisher). Mobile phase A was 0.1% FA

in water, and mobile phase B was 0.1% FA in ACN and the column was a 75 mm x 250 μm inner diameter 1.7 μM CSH C18, analytical column (Waters). A 1 μl aliquot of the sample (for proteome analysis) or a 3 μl aliquot was transferred to a 5 μl loop and loaded on to the column at a flow of 300 nl/min at 5% B for 5 and 13 min, respectively. The loop was then taken out of line and the flow was reduced from 300 nl/min to 200nl/min in 1 min., and to 7% B. Peptides were separated using a gradient that went from 7% to 18% B in 64 min., then from 18% to 27% B in 8 min. and finally from 27% B to 60% B in 1 min. The column was washed at 60% B for 3 min. and then re-equilibrated for a further 6.5 min. At 85 min, the flow was increased to 300nl/min until the end of the run at 90min. Mass spectrometry data were acquired in a data-dependent manner for 90 min in positive mode. Peptides were selected for fragmentation automatically by data-dependent analysis on a basis of the top 8 (phosphoproteome analysis) or top 12 (proteome analysis) with m/z between 300 and 1750Th and a charge state of 2, 3 or 4 with a dynamic exclusion set at 15 s. The MS resolution was set at 120,000 with an AGC target of 3e6 and a maximum fill time set at 20ms. The MS2 resolution was set to 60,000, with an AGC target of 2e5, and a maximum fill time of 110 ms for Top12 methods, and 30,000, with an AGC target of 2e5, and a maximum fill time of 45 ms for Top8 analysis. The isolation window was of 1.3Th and the collision energy was set at 28.

Data Analysis

Raw files were analysed by the MaxQuant software suite[71] (version 1.5.6.5) using the integrated Andromeda search engine. Proteins were identified by searching the HCD-MS/MS peak lists against a target/decoy version of the human UniProt Knowledgebase database that consisted of the complete proteome sets and isoforms (v.2019; https://uniprot.org/proteomes/UP000005640_9606) supplemented with commonly observed contaminants such as porcine trypsin and bovine serum proteins. Tandem mass spectra were initially matched with a mass tolerance of 7 ppm on precursor masses and 0.02 Da or 20 ppm for fragment ions. Cysteine carbamidomethylation was searched as a fixed modification. Protein N-acetylation, N-pyro-glutamine, oxidized methionine and phosphorylation of serine,

threonine and tyrosine were searched as variable modifications. Protein N-acetylation,

oxidized methionine and deamidation of asparagine and glutamine were searched as variable

modifications for the proteome experiments. Label-free parameters were used. False

discovery rate was set to 0.01 for peptides, proteins, and modification sites. Minimal peptide

length was six amino acids. Site localization probabilities were calculated by MaxQuant using

the PTM scoring algorithm. The datasets were filtered by posterior error probability to achieve

a false discovery rate below 1% for peptides, proteins, and modification sites. Only peptides

with Andromeda score > 40 were included in the downstream analysis.

For patient sample analysis, proteome quality control included proteins with more than 2

razor+unique peptides and greater than 5% protein sequence coverage. For the

phosphoproteome, localisation probability of 0.7 or higher was required for each site. Samples

with fewer than 2000 proteins or 2000 phosphorylated sites were excluded. Only proteins and

sites that were present in at least 80% of either non-metastatic or metastatic samples were

included in the final analysis. For cell line and metastatic effusion samples, we used the same

criteria as above and we included only proteins or phosphorylated sites that were present in

all samples.

All statistical and bioinformatics analysis was done using freely available software and

packages: Rstudio (R version 4.2.1, Rstudio version 2022.02.3) (http://www.rstudio.com),

Perseus (version 1.6.10.45)[72], STRING (version 11.5)[73], and Cytoscape (version 3.4.0)[74].

Differential expression analysis performed separately on proteome and phosphoproteome

using Rstudio package DEP (Bioconductor version 3.15). All peptide intensities were

normalised using the normalizeQuantiles function in the R package Limma[77]. Normalised

peptides were subjected to left-centred imputation and differential expression analysis using

the R packages DEP (PMID: 29446774) and Limma[77]. Differentially expressed proteins or

phosphorylated sites were defined in patient samples as those with a p value of less than 0.05

and a Log2 fold change of less than -1.5 or greater than +1.5, and in cell lines as those with a

p value of less than 0.05 and a Log2 fold change of less than -1 or greater than +1. Hierarchical

clustering and Vulcano plots analyses were performed using Perseus. Protein-protein

interactions networks were generated using STRING. Data were visualised with Cytoscape.

Analysis of the GEO datasets and single cell RNA seq dataset

603   The analysis of OMD expression in GEO datasets shown in Fig. 1F was performed using

604   Table 2 from reference[10]. Single cell RNA seq dataset was analysed using the online platform

605   CELLxGENE[28].

Generation of a Database of Breast Cancer Metastasis-Associated Genes and Proteins

This database was generated using the PubMed search term "Breast Cancer Metastasis" and

collecting the first 300 most relevant texts. Genes and proteins dysregulated in breast cancer

metastasis were extracted from papers and presented in the database with gene name,

protein name(s), a short summary of their contribution to breast cancer metastasis, the

reference for the energy, any specific organotropism associated with the entry and the level

at which the dysregulation occurs e.g., genomics, transcriptomic or proteomic.

Kaplan-Meier analysis

Gene IDs for OMD (205907_s_at, 205908_s_at) and CDK1 (203214_x_at, 210559_s_at,

203422_at, 203213_at) were used as input to the breast cancer mRNA gene chip dataset at

kmplot.com[34] to evaluate the effects of the two-gene signature on distant metastasis-free

survival. All patients and patients with estrogen receptor positive subtype were dichotomized

according to the auto selected best cutoff percentile of the mean expression of the gene

signature and the threshold set at 180 months.

Multivariate Survival Analysis

To assess the prognostic significance of a two-gene signature in breast cancer, we performed

a comprehensive search in the GEO (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/) and EGA

(https://ega-archive.org/) repositories. Transcriptomic datasets with DMFS data, with a

minimum of 30 samples, were included and focused on those generated using the platforms

GPL96, GPL570, and GPL571. The datasets used in this analysis were GSE2990, GSE3494,

GSE6532, GSE7390, GSE11121, GSE5327, GSE9195, GSE16446, GSE17907, GSE19615,

GSE20685, GSE26971, GSE16716, E-TABM-43, GSE45255, GSE25066, GSE22093,

GSE65194, GSE69031, GSE58812, and GSE61304. This selection ensured the use of a

consistent set of 22,277 genes across datasets, allowing for uniform sensitivity, specificity,

and dynamic range. Each dataset underwent rigorous normalization and quality control.

Initially, normalization was conducted using MAS5, a method chosen for its superior

performance in previous comparisons with RT-PCR-validated expression data. MAS5 also

enables the normalization of individual samples independently, which prevents the

recalibration of values when adding or removing samples. To reduce batch effects, a second

normalization step was applied, scaling the mean expression of overlapping probes to a value

of 1,000 across all arrays. Redundant samples with identical gene expression profiles were

identified and excluded, retaining only the earliest version to ensure unique biological

representation. Quality control metrics were assessed across five parameters, including

background signal, raw Q values, the percentage of present calls, bioBCD spike-in controls,

and the GAPDH/ACTB 3-to-5 ratio. Samples were deemed acceptable if they met the

expected range for all parameters, while outliers and biased arrays, failing two or more criteria,

were excluded from downstream analyses. Following this process, 2,828 unique samples with

high-quality data were retained for subsequent analysis. The two-gene signature was

constructed by calculating the mean expression of the probes corresponding to OMD

(osteoadherin) and CDK1 (cyclin-dependent kinase 1). The signature utilized six probe sets:

205908_s_at, 205907_s_at (OMD), and 203214_x_at, 210559_s_at, 203422_at, 203213_at

(CDK1). Survival analysis was performed to evaluate the association between the signature

and distant metastasis-free survival (DMFS). The mean expression of the signature was

assessed across potential cutoff values spanning the interquartile range, with statistical

significance determined using Cox proportional hazards regression models. False Discovery

Rate (FDR) correction was applied using the Benjamini-Hochberg method. Subgroup

analyses were conducted for estrogen receptor-positive (ER+), triple-negative breast cancer

(TNBC), and all tumors collectively. The independent prognostic value of the signature was

further assessed using multivariate Cox regression, accounting for available clinical and

pathological parameters including HER2 expression, lymph node status, tumor grade, tumor

size, and patient age.

Immunohistochemistry

500,000 bone marrow cells were pelleted onto glass slides using a Shandon Cytospin 3

centrifuge at 600rpm. Cytospin samples were fixed in 4% neutral-buffered formalin in PBS and

permeabilised with 0.25% Triton X-100. Endogenous peroxidases were blocked with hydrogen

peroxide (10%), samples were blocked with Casein. Samples were incubated with 200µg/ml

anti-Cytokeratin 19 primary antibody (CK19) was biotinylated using DAKO Animal Research

kit (ARK) and incubated on samples for 30 minutes at room temperature. ARK kit anti-biotin

secondary antibodies were incubated on samples for 30 minutes before staining with DAB

stain to produce a colorimetric response. Gills I haemotoxylin was used for counterstaining

and samples were coverslipped before imaging. TBST washes were performed between each

step. Whole slide imaging was performed using Olympus VS200 MTL (Olympus Life Science)

in conjunction with an Olympus UPLXAPO20X objective lens and 20x magnification. Lung

metastatic tumour lesions, identified in collaboration with Visualisation, Imaging and Analysis

Core Facility at Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute, of greater than 100µm in diameter

(in one orientation) were counted using OlyVIA to assess the number of macrometastases in

the lungs. For quantification of cytokeratin 19-positive cells in cytospins of the bone marrow

flushes for figure 6C and D, slides were scanned and images were opened in OlyVIA and

sample coordinates were determined and a random number generator was used to select

coordinates in which five fields of view at 10X magnification were used to count the number of

CK19-positive cells. For quantification of cytokeratin 19-positive cells in cytospins of the bone

marrow flushes for figure 6E and 6F, slides were scanned, and images were opened in OlyVIA

and all 4 quadrants of the cytospins were scored to enumerate the CK-positive cells in control

and CDK1 inhibitor treated mice. Immunohistochemical staining of patient samples for

osteomodulin required sample dewaxing in xylene, washing sequentially with 100% industrial

denatured alcohol (IDA), 90% IDA and 70% IDA and deionised water. Antigen retrieval was

performed in DAKO pH9 antigen retrieval solution using an EZ Retriever system (BioGenex)

at 98°C for 15 minutes. Samples were washed with deionised water and PBS. Endogenous

peroxidases were blocked by incubation with 10% hydrogen peroxide in PBS for 10 minutes.

Slides were incubated with Casein for 1 hour at 37°C. Anti-OMD primary antibody was added

at 1:50 for 1 hour at 37°C. Slides were washed three times with PBS. Envision anti-mouse

secondary fluorescent antibody was added to slides for 30 minutes at 37°C. Slides were

washed twice with PBS. DAB was added (1 drop DAB in 1ml diluent) to slides for 5 minutes

before washing with deionised water and staining for 10 seconds with Gills I haemotoxylin.

Slides were washed with water, 70% IDA, 90% IDA and 100% IDA. Slides were air-dried and

scanned as above. Analysis for our cohort of patient samples was performed by consultant

pathologist Nisha Ali who selected five fields of view per slide and assessed the cell types that

were positively stained within each field of view based on morphology. Haemotoxylin and

Eosin staining of breast cancer patient samples was performed by Cancer Research UK

Manchester Institute Histology facility and epithelial percentage in each section was calculated

by pathologist Nisha Ali who identified epithelial cells by morphology and estimate the area

covered by epithelial cells compared to the total size of tissue on the slide. Analysis of primary

tumours from patients recruited into the trial [29] were performed on TMAs constructed for the

purpose of this study. Identification of positively stained areas was conducted using QuPath

version 0.2.3 using the positive pixel count module.

Quantitative RT-PCR

RNA was isolated from cells at 70-90% confluency using a ReliaPrep™ RNA Cell Miniprep

system according to manufacturer's instructions. Isolated RNA was reverse transcribed using

a GoScript™ Reverse Transcription System according to manufacturer's instructions. Specific

genes within complementary DNA (cDNA) were amplified using gene-specific primers and a

2X SYBR Green mixture. The qPCR machines used were the Agilent Mx3000P and the Aria

Mx Real-time qPCR System. Relative expression was quantified using the Delta-Delta-CT

method with β-actin as a housekeeping gene.

Cell Lysis and Immunoblotting

Cell lines were lysed with SDS sample buffer supplemented with beta mercaptoethanol and

samples were heated at 95 degrees for 30 minutes. Patient samples were pelleted and lysed

at 4°C on a rotating wheel for 1 hr. Lysates were centrifuged at 12,000g to remove debris.

Supernatant was quantified using Pierce™ BCA Protein Assay (ThermoFisher) following the

manufacturers protocol. Lysates were normalised to the same concentration and boiled at

95°C for 5 minutes. All proteins were resolved by SDS-PAGE and transferred onto

nitrocellulose membranes. Specific antibodies were used to probe for proteins of interest and

peroxidase-labelled secondary antibodies recognised primary antibodies. An enhanced

chemiluminescence kit (Biorad) was used to assess expression and blots were visualised

using a Universal Hood II Gel Molecular Imaging System (Biorad).

Densitometric analysis was performed using ImageJ (version 1.52). Tiff images exported from

ImageLab (Biorad) were converted to 8bit images. The square selection tool was used to

highlight the first lane and pressing Ctrl+1 allows the dimensions of this box to be moved over

each lane so that the selection size was identical. Background was subtracted from the

generated base of the intensity curves using the line tool. The magic wand tool was used to

highlight the area underneath each peak providing a quantification of the area under the

intensity curve. Intensity values were divided by the loading control from the same lane to

normalise peak intensities.

EdU Incorporation Assay

Cells were incubated with 20µM 5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine (EdU) for 4 hours at 37°C. Cells

were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) in PBS and processed according to

manufacturer's instructions. After staining, cells were counterstained with 5ng/ml Hoechst

3342 for 30 minutes and counted using a Leica microscope system. Approximately 100

stained nuclei were counted before changing to a FITC filter and counting the number of cells

that also stained for Alexa488.

Collagen Contractility Assay

Flat-bottomed 96 well plates were coated with 100µl of sterile-filtered 3% bovine serum

albumin (BSA) in PBS for at least 1 hour at 37°C before aspiration. 50,000 HFOB 1.19 cells

or 100,000 of MDA-MB-231, HMFU19 or 544R CAFs were resuspended in 10ul of their

respective medias. 7mg/ml Bovine type I collagen solution with 10% FCS at pH 7.7 was made.

90µl of the collagen mixture was mixed with 10µl cell suspension and added to a coated well

and allowed to set at 37°C for 1 hour. 100µl of media was added. Any drugs or recombinant

protein used were added in this 100µl such as recombinant OMD on top of the collagen plug.

Samples were incubated at 37°C for 72 hours before imaging using a GelCount image system.

Images were analysed using area measurements on ImageJ.

Boyden Chamber Invasion Assay

Matrigel (Corning) was diluted to 300µg/ml in PBS and 100µl was added to an 8µm pore 24

well Boyden chamber insert (Corning). Plates were incubated at 37°C overnight to allow

Matrigel to set. 25,000 cells per well were added in 500µl starvation media to the top of the

chamber 750µl of complete media was added below the chamber. Cells were incubated for

24 hours at 37°C. Matrigel was poured from the chamber. Cells were fixed with 400µl of 4%

PFA for 20 minutes, washed with PBS, permeabilised with 0.1% Triton x-100 in PBS for 15

minutes, washed with PBS and stained with 0.1% crystal violet (Sigma-Aldrich) in 4% PFA in

PBS. Wells were washed with PBS and water and air dried. Absorbance at 590nm was used

to assess crystal violet staining per well which shows the number of cells that migrated through

the Matrigel plug and the insert membrane.

Scratch Wound Cell Migration Assay

40,000 MDA-MB-231 cells and 70,000 MCF-7 cells per well were plated in a flat-bottomed 96

well plate (Corning) and incubated at 37°C overnight to reach 100% confluence. Cells were

treated for 2 hours at 37°C with 10µg/ml mitomycin (Fisher Scientific) to prevent cell

proliferation. An Essen bioscience woundmaker was used to create an even scratch in each

well. Wells were washed with PBS and starvation media was added to each well. Recombinant

OMD or CDK1 or CDK4,6 inhibitors were added to starvation media. Conditioned media was

added in place of starvation media for conditioned media experiments. Images of each well

were taken every hour using an Incucyte S3 system with 4x objective. Wound density at every

hour over 48 hours was measured using ImageJ. The final wound density at 48 hours post-

scratch was used as a measure of the degree of migration of cells.

Mammosphere Assays

Flat-bottomed 6 well plates were coated with polyHEMA for 48 hours at 40°C until dry.

Trypsinised cells were disaggregated to a single cell suspension by passing cells three times

through a 25-gauge needle. 3000 disaggregated cells per well were plated into 2ml

mammosphere media (DMEM/F12 with B27 supplement and 20ng/ml EGF (Sigma-Aldrich))

and cultured for 5 days in suspension before counting mammosphere greater than 50µm in

size (width and height). Mammosphere forming efficiency as counted by dividing the number

of mammosphere formed by the number of cells plated initially. Primary mammosphere were

trypsin-digested and needle disaggregated as above and were plated at a density of 3000

cells per well into new polyHEMA-coated plates in 2ml of mammosphere media and incubated

for 5 days in suspension. Mammosphere self-renewal percentage was calculated by dividing

the number of secondary mammosphere that formed over the number of primary

mammosphere and multiplying by 100.

Alkaline Phosphatase Activity Assay

A p-Nitrophenyl Phosphate, Disodium Salt (PnPP) standard curve of 33µM, 67µM, 100µM,

133µM and 167µM in assay buffer was produced as a substrate curve for alkaline

phosphatase modification. HFOB 1.19 cells were trypsinised, pelleted, resuspended in PBS and 50,000 cells were pelleted and 50µl of assay buffer and 50µl of lysis buffer (20mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 160mM NaCl, 1mM $CaCl_2$, 1% Triton-X-100) and pipetted up and down 20 times to lyse cells. Samples were centrifuged at 18000xg for 15 minutes at 4°C to pellet insoluble material. 20µl of each supernatant was added to 60µl of assay buffer and 50µl 5mM PnPP in a 96 well plate. 10µl of alkaline phosphatase enzyme was added to each standard well and mixed by pipetting up and down. Samples were incubated at room temperature in the dark for 1 hour. 20µl of stop solution was added to each sample and optical density at 405nm was measured using a plate reader (Agilent/Biotek). Alkaline phosphatase activity was measured by comparing OD at 405nm to the standard curve of known alkaline phosphatase activity. Data were presented as µmol/min/ml of substrate modified by alkaline phosphatase per minute per ml of reaction mixture.

Alizarin Red Staining

HFOB 1.19 cells were cultured at 34°C for undifferentiated cells or 39°C for differentiation. Media was changed every 2 days, including treatments such as recombinant OMD. Conditioned media was added 1:1 with HFOB 1.19 media. When cells reached 80% (for 34°C condition) or after 7 days (for 39°C condition) they were fixed with ethanol, washed with PBS and stained with 40mM Alizarin red pH 4.2 in water for 1 hour at room temperature on a rocker. Plates were washed with 95% ethanol until all unbound stain was removed. Plates were scanned on a GelCount plate imager (Oxford Optronix) and the percentage area stained with calcium per well was calculated using ImageJ.

Bone Resorption Assay

Bovine cortical bone slices were UV-sterilised and added to a flat-bottomed 96 well plate. 50,000 RAW 264.7 cells (undifferentiated or RANKL-differentiated) were added to each well in 100µl media (complete media or conditioned media) including any DMSO or recombinant OMD treatment required. Cells were cultured for 7 days and media was changed every 48-72

hours. Bone discs were fixed in 4% PFA in PBS for 10 minutes at room temperature. Samples

were stained with 1% toluidine blue in water for 4 minutes. Samples were sonicated at 25%

amplitude (50-60Hz) for 30 minutes in deionised water to remove bound cells which may be

blocking pits from being stained. Samples were stained again with 1% toludine blue in water

for 4 minutes. Samples were washed with deionised water, air dried and imaged using a Leica

M205 Stereo Fluorescence System at 0.912X magnification. Resorption pits were quantified

and measured using ImageJ where pits of a minimum of 0.01mm in width and length were

counted.

Alamar Blue Cell Viability Assay

U-bottomed 96 well plates were coated with 100µl polyHEMA for 48 hours at 40°C until dry.

10,000 cells were plated in DMEM (for MDA-MB-231 cells) with 10% FCS, 1% Pen-Strep,

1mM Sodium Pyruvate or Advanced DMEM/F12 with FCS, 1ug/ml hydrocortisone and

20ng/ml EGF (for cells from metastatic effusion samples). 10µl alamar blue reagent was added

to each well and incubated for 4 hours at 37°C. Fluorescence at 590nm was measured using

a VarioSkan Lux with SkanIT 6.1 software. At least 3 biological replicates were performed for

each condition for MDA-MB-231 cells and 3 technical replicates were performed for effusion

samples from one effusion drain per patient.

Quantification of OMD in conditioned medium and metastatic fluids

Conditioned medium (CM) was derived using serum free medium. 231-OMD, HMFU19 and

544R were cultured at 37°C and 5% CO_2 for 72hrs. At 24-hour intervals, the medium was

collected, pooled, and replaced with fresh serum free medium. The CM was then centrifuged

at 500g for 20 minutes and then concentrated using Vivaspin Turbo 15 Centrifugal

Concentrator 10 kDa PES tubes. The resulting samples and the metastatic fluids derived from

ascitic drains and pleural effusions were then analysed using a Human

Osteoadherin/Osteomodulin ELISA Kit following manufacturer's instructions Briefly, 100 µL of

concentrated medium from each condition was added and incubated for 2.5hrs. Following

washing, 100 μL of biotinylated antibody was incubated for 1hr. The wells were washed again

and 100 μL of Streptavidin was added and incubated for 45mins. Following washing, 100 μL

of TMB One-Step Substrate Reagent was added and incubated in the dark for 30mins. Finally,

50 μL of stop solution was added and read at 450 nm.

Statistics

Experiments were performed in at least three independent biological triplicates. One-way

ANOVAs with Dunnett's multiple comparisons test were used to determine significance

between 3 or more experimental conditions. In experiments where the data was not normal,

Kruskal-Wallis with Dunn's multiple comparisons test was used to determine significance

between 3 or more experimental conditions. Student's t tests were used to determine

significance between two experimental conditions.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Proteomics analysis identifies enrichment of OMD in samples from patients who developed bone metastases **A,** Workflow of the proteomics and phosphoproteomics analysis of patient-derived samples. The characteristics of samples and the numbers of proteins and phosphorylated sites identified are indicated. Tissue and mouse images were downloaded from SmartServier Medical Art. **B, C,** Volcano plots showing differentially expressed proteins (B) or phosphorylated sites (C) based on Limma *p* value <0.05, Log2 Fold change >1.5 between metastatic and non-metastatic samples. Proteins or sites upregulated in patients who developed metastases are in orange while proteins and sites downregulated in patients who developed metastases are in blue. Proteins and phosphorylated sites previously associated with breast cancer metastasis regulation are labelled (see Table S7). **D,** KEGG and GO terms enrichment analysis of differentially regulated proteins and phosphorylated sites between metastatic and non-metastatic samples from B and C. Adjusted *p* values are generated using Fisher's exact test with Benjamini-Hochberg correction. **E,** Osteomodulin (OMD) log2 normalised protein intensity in non-metastatic patients, metastatic patients, patients who developed bone metastases or patients who developed metastases at any other sites not including bone. Data represent mean +/- SEM of 15 non-metastatic samples compared to 20 metastatic samples, and 12 bone-metastatic samples compared to 8 non-bone metastatic samples (Limma *p* values ** <0.01, *** <0.001, **** <0.0001) and are visualised in the same graph. **F,** OMD mRNA levels in bone metastasis and in metastases to other organs from the GEO datasets (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6424882/). Data (37 bone metastatic patient samples, 148 other metastatic site patient samples) are represented as mean (Limma *p* values with Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate Correction < 0.0001****). See also Figures S1-2, Tables S1-7.

Figure 2. OMD regulates cell migration *in vitro* in both ER+ and ER- cell line models of breast cancer. **A, B,** Immunoblotting analysis with the indicated antibodies of total lysates from MDA-MB-231 cells stably transfected with mApple (231-mA) or an OMD-T2A-mApple construct

(231-OMD) and grown in complete or starved medium (A) and of conditioned medium from

the same cells (B) N=3 independent biological replicates. **C,** Cell migration of 231-mA (grey),

231-OMD (red), 231-mA treated with 10, 100 or 1000 ng/ml of rOMD assessed by wound

density (percentage of the wound filled with cells 48hrs post-scratch compared to time zero).

D, Representative images from C. Scale bar = 1mm. **E,** Cell migration of MCF-7 (orange)

treated with 10, 100 or 1000 ng/ml of rOMD assessed by wound density (percentage of the

wound filled with cells 48hrs post-scratch compared to time zero). **F,** Representative images

from E. Scale bar = 1mm. **C, E,** Data represents the mean +/- SEM of N = 3 independent

biological replicates, each including at least 3 technical triplicates. p =< 0.05*, < 0.01**, <

0.001***, < 0.0001**** (One Way ANOVA with Dunnett's Multiple Comparison Test, compared

to untreated control). **D, F,** The yellow lines indicate wound gap at 48h. See also Figures S3-

4.

Figure 3. OMD is expressed by cancer-associated fibroblasts in patient samples and

fibroblast-derived conditioned media drives cell migration. **A,** Single cell RNAseq UMAP

analysis of 26 primary breast cancer samples showcasing all the cell types[78]. **B,** UMAP

analysis of OMD RNA levels from the dataset in A. UMAP plot of OMD expression across all

cell types analysed using CELLxGENE[28]. Black circle highlights the fibroblast population as

containing cells expressing OMD. **C,** ELISA-based quantification of OMD secretion from

conditioned media (CM) collected from 231-OMD and 544R cells. Data represents the mean

+/- SEM of N = 3 independent biological replicates, each including 2 technical replicates. **D,**

Cell migration of 231-mA cells treated with 1000 ng/mL rOMD or with CM derived from 544R

(blue) assessed by wound density (percentage of the wound filled with cells 48hrs post-scratch

compared to time zero). **E,** Representative images from D. Scale bar = 1mm. **F,** Cell migration

of MCF-7 treated with 1000 ng/mL rOMD or with CM derived from 544R (blue) assessed by

wound density (percentage of the wound filled with cells 48hrs post-scratch compared to time

zero). **G,** Representative images from F. Scale bar = 1mm. **D, F,** Data represents the mean

+/- SEM of N = 3 independent biological replicates, each including at least 3 technical

triplicates (Mann-Whitney Test). **E, G,** The yellow lines indicate wound gap at 48hrs. See also

Figure S5.

Figure 4. Phosphoproteomics identifies the OMD-CDK1 axis in breast cancer and patient-

derived samples. **A,** Volcano plot showing differentially regulated phosphorylated sites in 231-

OMD cells compared to 231-mApple cells based on Limma *p* value <0.05, Log2 Fold Change

>1. Orange, upregulated in 231-OMD; blue, downregulated in 231-OMD; black text,

downregulated sites in 231-OMD compared to 231-mApple and in 231-Bo OMD compared to

231-Bo; red text, sites with metastasis-associated functions according to Phosphosite plus. **B,**

C, Immunoblotting analysis with indicated antibodies of 231-mApple, 231-OMD, 231-Bo and

231-Bo OMD cell lysates (B) followed by quantification via densitometry and normalisation to

vinculin (C). Data is presented as the ratio between the intensity of CDK1 phosphorylated on

Y15 and the intensity of the loading control. Values were calculated using ImageJ and are

presented relative to 231-mA band intensity. N = 3 independent biological replicates p =<

0.05*, < 0.01**, < 0.001***, < 0.0001**** (Student's t-test). **D, E,** Expression of OMD and of

phosphorylated CDK1 on Y15 from two independent proteomics and phosphoproteomics

datasets [11,33]. Data is presented as mean +/- SEM of Log2 iTRAQ ratios (N = 83) and Log TMT

ratios (N = 122), respectively, and compared to an internal standard. *p* =< 0.05*, < 0.01**, <

0.001***, < 0.0001**** (Student's *t*-test). **F, G,** Kaplan-Meyer analysis of distant metastasis

free survival with high and low expression of OMD and CDK1 in all breast cancer patients (F)

and those with the estrogen receptor positive (ER+) subtype (G) for 180 months. See also

Figures S6, Tables S6-12.

Figure 5. CDK1 regulates cell migration and viability downstream of OMD *in vitro*. **A,** Cell

migration of 231-mA and 231-OMD treated with either DMSO, 10 µM RO-3306 (CDK1i) or 10

µM Palbociclib (CDK4/6i) assessed by wound closure and measured by wound density. **B,**

C, Cell migration of 231-mA (B) and MCF-7 (C) cells treated with either DMSO or 1000 ng/mL

rOMD in the presence or absence of 10 µM RO-3306 assessed by wound closure over 48hrs

and measured by wound density. **D,** Cell migration of 231-mA and MCF-7 cells treated with

the 544R conditioned medium (CM) in the presence or absence of 10 µM RO-3306. **E, F,**

Relative viability of 231-mA (E) and MCF-7 (F) following treatment with 10 µM CDK1i. Data is

represented as mean +/- SEM of N >= 3 independent biological replicates. p =< 0.05*, < 0.01**,

< 0.001***, < 0.0001**** (Student's *t*-test). **G,** Table showing the 5 patients from which

metastatic effusions were collected along with their clinical characteristics and metastatic sites

at time of collection. BB7210 had two drains collected at different timepoints (T1, T3). ER –

Estrogen receptor, PR – Progesterone Receptor, HER2 – Human Epidermal Receptor 2. **H,**

ELISA-based quantification of OMD in the metastatic fluid of the patients described in G. Data

represents the mean +/- SEM of N = 1, each including two technical replicates. **I,**

Immunoblotting analysis with the indicated antibodies of total lysates from fresh frozen

samples derived from the patients illustrated in G, with the exception of BB3RC82. **J,** Relative

viability of 6 metastatic fluid samples following treatment with 10 µM CDK1i. Data is

represented as mean +/- SEM of N>= 1 independent biological replicates. p =< 0.05*, < 0.01**,

< 0.001***, < 0.0001**** (Student's *t*-test). **A, B, C,** Data represent the percentage of the

wound filled with cells 48 hours post-scratch. N = 3 biologically independent replicates. p =<

0.05*, < 0.01**, < 0.001***, < 0.0001**** (One Way ANOVA with Dunnett's Multiple

Comparison Test, compared to untreated control). See also Figures S7, Tables S13-14.

Figure 6. The OMD-CDK1 axis drives bone metastasis and bone colonization *in vivo*. **A,**

Diagram illustrating the set-up of the *in vivo* experiments in athymic nude mice following the

intracardiac injection of 100,000 231-mA, 231-OMD, or 231-Bo cells (i) and of 100,000 231-

OMD cells followed by treatment with 4 mg/mL CDK1i (ii). Figure designed using

Biorender.com. **B,** Number of metastatic lung lesions of over 100 µm in diameter (in at least 1

dimension) following intracardiac injection in N = 4 mice per cell line. **C,** Number of cytokeratin

19 (CK19)-positive human cells identified in cytospun bone flushes from the same mice. p =<

0.05*, < 0.01**, < 0.001***, < 0.0001**** (Mean +/- SEM, Student's *t*-test, each compared to

231-mA). **D,** Representative images from C where red arrows indicated CK19-positive cells.

E, Number of CK19-positive human cells identified in cytospun bone flushes following

intracardiac injection and treatment with CDK1 inhibitor 4 mg/kg RO-3306 or vehicle control 3

times per week for 25 days in N = 4 mice per condition. *p* =< 0.05*, < 0.01**, < 0.001***, <

0.0001**** (Mean +/- SEM, Student's *t*-test, each compared to 231-mA). **F,** Representative

images from E where red arrows indicate CK19-positive cells.

References

1.   Nolan, E., Lindeman, G.J., and Visvader, J.E. (2023). Deciphering breast cancer: from

biology to the clinic. Cell *186*, 1708-1728. 10.1016/j.cell.2023.01.040.

2.   Riggio, A.I., Varley, K.E., and Welm, A.L. (2021). The lingering mysteries of metastatic

recurrence in breast cancer. British Journal of Cancer *124*, 13-26. 10.1038/s41416-

020-01161-4.

3.   Fornetti, J., Welm, A.L., and Stewart, S.A. (2018). Understanding the Bone in Cancer

Metastasis. J Bone Miner Res *33*, 2099-2113. 10.1002/jbmr.3618.

4.   Mundy, G.R. (2002). Metastasis to bone: causes, consequences and therapeutic

opportunities. Nat Rev Cancer *2*, 584-593. 10.1038/nrc867.

5.   Satcher, R.L., and Zhang, X.H. (2022). Evolving cancer-niche interactions and

therapeutic targets during bone metastasis. Nat Rev Cancer *22*, 85-101.

10.1038/s41568-021-00406-5.

6.   Zhang, W., Bado, I.L., Hu, J., Wan, Y.W., Wu, L., Wang, H., Gao, Y., Jeong, H.H., Xu,

Z., Hao, X., et al. (2021). The bone microenvironment invigorates metastatic seeds for

further dissemination. Cell *184*, 2471-2486 e2420. 10.1016/j.cell.2021.03.011.

7.   Coleman, R.E., and Rubens, R.D. (1987). The clinical course of bone metastases from

breast cancer. Br J Cancer *55*, 61-66. 10.1038/bjc.1987.13.

8.   Parsons, J., and Francavilla, C. (2019). 'Omics Approaches to Explore the Breast

Cancer Landscape. Front Cell Dev Biol *7*, 395. 10.3389/fcell.2019.00395.

9.   Paul, M.R., Pan, T.C., Pant, D.K., Shih, N.N., Chen, Y., Harvey, K.L., Solomon, A.,

Lieberman, D., Morrissette, J.J., Soucier-Ernst, D., et al. (2020). Genomic landscape

of metastatic breast cancer identifies preferentially dysregulated pathways and targets.

J Clin Invest *130*, 4252-4265. 10.1172/jci129941.

10.   Zhang, Y., He, W., and Zhang, S. (2019). Seeking for Correlative Genes and Signaling

Pathways With Bone Metastasis From Breast Cancer by Integrated Analysis. Front

Oncol *9*, 138. 10.3389/fonc.2019.00138.

11.   Krug, K., Jaehnig, E.J., Satpathy, S., Blumenberg, L., Karpova, A., Anurag, M., Miles,

1004   G., Mertins, P., Geffen, Y., Tang, L.C., et al. (2020). Proteogenomic Landscape of

1005   Breast Cancer Tumorigenesis and Targeted Therapy. Cell *183*, 1436-1456.e1431.

1006   10.1016/j.cell.2020.10.036.

1007   12.   Anurag, M., Jaehnig, E.J., Krug, K., Lei, J.T., Bergstrom, E.J., Kim, B.-J., Vashist, T.D.,

1008   Tran Huynh, A.M., Dou, Y., Gou, X., et al. (2022). Proteogenomic markers of

1009   chemotherapy resistance and response in triple negative breast cancer. Cancer

1010   Discovery, CD-22-0200. 10.1158/2159-8290.CD-22-0200.

1011   13.   Zagorac, I., Fernandez-Gaitero, S., Penning, R., Post, H., Bueno, M.J., Mouron, S.,

1012   Manso, L., Morente, M.M., Alonso, S., Serra, V., et al. (2018). In vivo

1013   phosphoproteomics reveals kinase activity profiles that predict treatment outcome in

1014   triple-negative breast cancer. Nature Communications *9*, 3501. 10.1038/s41467-018-

1015   05742-z.

1016   14.   Satpathy, S., Jaehnig, E.J., Krug, K., Kim, B.-J., Saltzman, A.B., Chan, D.W.,

1017   Holloway, K.R., Anurag, M., Huang, C., Singh, P., et al. (2020). Microscaled

1018   proteogenomic methods for precision oncology. Nature Communications *11*, 532.

1019   10.1038/s41467-020-14381-2.

1020   15.   Ramstad, V.E., Franzen, A., Heinegard, D., Wendel, M., and Reinholt, F.P. (2003).

1021   Ultrastructural distribution of osteoadherin in rat bone shows a pattern similar to that

1022   of bone sialoprotein. Calcif Tissue Int *72*, 57-64. 10.1007/s00223-002-2047-9.

1023   16.   Sommarin, Y., Wendel, M., Shen, Z., Hellman, U., and Heinegard, D. (1998).

1024   Osteoadherin, a cell-binding keratan sulfate proteoglycan in bone, belongs to the

1025   family of leucine-rich repeat proteins of the extracellular matrix. J Biol Chem *273*,

1026   16723-16729. 10.1074/jbc.273.27.16723.

1027   17.   Watson, J., Ferguson, H.R., Brady, R.M., Ferguson, J., Fullwood, P., Mo, H., Bexley,

1028   K.H., Knight, D., Howell, G., Schwartz, J.M., et al. (2022). Spatially resolved

1029   phosphoproteomics reveals fibroblast growth factor receptor recycling-driven

regulation of autophagy and survival. Nat Commun *13*, 6589. 10.1038/s41467-022-

34298-2.

18. Song, K., Yu, Z., Zu, X., Li, G., Hu, Z., and Xue, Y. (2022). Collagen Remodeling along

Cancer Progression Providing a Novel Opportunity for Cancer Diagnosis and

Treatment. Int J Mol Sci *23*. 10.3390/ijms231810509.

19. Roudier, M.P., Winters, B.R., Coleman, I., Lam, H.M., Zhang, X., Coleman, R., Chéry,

L., True, L.D., Higano, C.S., Montgomery, B., et al. (2016). Characterizing the

molecular features of ERG-positive tumors in primary and castration resistant prostate

cancer. Prostate *76*, 810-822. 10.1002/pros.23171.

20. Kojima, K., Shimanuki, M., Shikami, M., Andreeff, M., and Nakakuma, H. (2009).

Cyclin-dependent kinase 1 inhibitor RO-3306 enhances p53-mediated Bax activation

and mitochondrial apoptosis in AML. Cancer Sci *100*, 1128-1136. 10.1111/j.1349-

7006.2009.01150.x.

21. O'Hare, M.J., Bond, J., Clarke, C., Takeuchi, Y., Atherton, A.J., Berry, C., Moody, J.,

Silver, A.R., Davies, D.C., Alsop, A.E., et al. (2001). Conditional immortalization of

freshly isolated human mammary fibroblasts and endothelial cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci

U S A *98*, 646-651. 10.1073/pnas.98.2.646.

22. Harris, S.A., Enger, R.J., Riggs, L.B., and Spelsberg, T.C. (1995). Development and

characterization of a conditionally immortalized human fetal osteoblastic cell line.

Journal of Bone and Mineral Research *10*, 178-186.

https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.5650100203.

23. Lampiasi, N., Russo, R., Kireev, I., Strelkova, O., Zhironkina, O., and Zito, F. (2021).

Osteoclasts Differentiation from Murine RAW 264.7 Cells Stimulated by RANKL:

Timing and Behavior. Biology (Basel) *10*. 10.3390/biology10020117.

24. Papadaki, V., Asada, K., Watson, J.K., Tamura, T., Leung, A., Hopkins, J., Dellett, M.,

Sasai, N., Davaapil, H., Nik-Zainal, S., et al. (2020). Two Secreted Proteoglycans,

Activators of Urothelial Cell-Cell Adhesion, Negatively Contribute to Bladder Cancer

Initiation and Progression. Cancers (Basel) *12*. 10.3390/cancers12113362.

25.   Macedo, F., Ladeira, K., Pinho, F., Saraiva, N., Bonito, N., Pinto, L., and Goncalves,
1059   F. (2017). Bone Metastases: An Overview. Oncol Rev *11*, 321.
1060   10.4081/oncol.2017.321.

1061   26.   Tashima, T., Nagatoishi, S., Sagara, H., Ohnuma, S., and Tsumoto, K. (2015).
1062   Osteomodulin regulates diameter and alters shape of collagen fibrils. Biochem Biophys
1063   Res Commun *463*, 292-296. 10.1016/j.bbrc.2015.05.053.

1064   27.   Bos, P.D., Zhang, X.H., Nadal, C., Shu, W., Gomis, R.R., Nguyen, D.X., Minn, A.J.,
1065   van de Vijver, M.J., Gerald, W.L., Foekens, J.A., and Massagué, J. (2009). Genes that
1066   mediate breast cancer metastasis to the brain. Nature *459*, 1005-1009.
1067   10.1038/nature08021.

1068   28.   Program, C.Z.I.C.S., Abdulla, S., Aevermann, B., Assis, P., Badajoz, S., Bell, S.M.,
1069   Bezzi, E., Cakir, B., Chaffer, J., Chambers, S., et al. (2025). CZ CELLxGENE Discover:
1070   a single-cell data platform for scalable exploration, analysis and modeling of
1071   aggregated data. Nucleic Acids Res *53*, D886-D900. 10.1093/nar/gkae1142.

1072   29.   Coleman, R., Cameron, D., Dodwell, D., Bell, R., Wilson, C., Rathbone, E., Keane, M.,
1073   Gil, M., Burkinshaw, R., Grieve, R., et al. (2014). Adjuvant zoledronic acid in patients
1074   with early breast cancer: final efficacy analysis of the AZURE (BIG 01/04) randomised
1075   open-label phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol *15*, 997-1006. 10.1016/S1470-2045(14)70302-
1076   X.

1077   30.   Hornbeck, P.V., Kornhauser, J.M., Tkachev, S., Zhang, B., Skrzypek, E., Murray, B.,
1078   Latham, V., and Sullivan, M. (2012). PhosphoSitePlus: a comprehensive resource for
1079   investigating the structure and function of experimentally determined post-translational
1080   modifications in man and mouse. Nucleic Acids Res *40*, D261-270.
1081   10.1093/nar/gkr1122.

1082   31.   Belguise, K., Milord, S., Galtier, F., Moquet-Torcy, G., Piechaczyk, M., and Chalbos,
1083   D. (2012). The PKCθ pathway participates in the aberrant accumulation of Fra-1
1084   protein in invasive ER-negative breast cancer cells. Oncogene *31*, 4889-4897.
1085   10.1038/onc.2011.659.

1086   32.   Potapova, T.A., Daum, J.R., Byrd, K.S., and Gorbsky, G.J. (2009). Fine tuning the cell

1087   cycle: activation of the Cdk1 inhibitory phosphorylation pathway during mitotic exit. Mol

1088   Biol Cell *20*, 1737-1748. 10.1091/mbc.e08-07-0771.

1089   33.   Mertins, P., Mani, D.R., Ruggles, K.V., Gillette, M.A., Clauser, K.R., Wang, P., Wang,

1090   X., Qiao, J.W., Cao, S., Petralia, F., et al. (2016). Proteogenomics connects somatic

1091   mutations to signalling in breast cancer. Nature *534*, 55-62. 10.1038/nature18003.

1092   34.   Gyorffy, B. (2021). Survival analysis across the entire transcriptome identifies

1093   biomarkers with the highest prognostic power in breast cancer. Comput Struct

1094   Biotechnol J *19*, 4101-4109. 10.1016/j.csbj.2021.07.014.

1095   35.   Vassilev, L.T., Tovar, C., Chen, S., Knezevic, D., Zhao, X., Sun, H., Heimbrook, D.C.,

1096   and Chen, L. (2006). Selective small-molecule inhibitor reveals critical mitotic functions

1097   of   human   CDK1.   Proc   Natl   Acad   Sci   U   S   A   *103*,   10660-10665.

1098   10.1073/pnas.0600447103.

1099   36.   Rampersad, S.N. (2012). Multiple applications of Alamar Blue as an indicator of

1100   metabolic function and cellular health in cell viability bioassays. Sensors (Basel) *12*,

1101   12347-12360. 10.3390/s120912347.

1102   37.   Krek, W., and Nigg, E.A. (1991). Differential phosphorylation of vertebrate p34cdc2

1103   kinase at the G1/S and G2/M transitions of the cell cycle: identification of major

1104   phosphorylation sites. EMBO J *10*, 305-316. 10.1002/j.1460-2075.1991.tb07951.x.

1105   38.   Watase, C., Shiino, S., Shimoi, T., Noguchi, E., Kaneda, T., Yamamoto, Y., Yonemori,

1106   K., Takayama, S., and Suto, A. (2021). Breast Cancer Brain Metastasis-Overview of

1107   Disease State, Treatment Options and Future Perspectives. Cancers (Basel) *13*.

1108   10.3390/cancers13051078.

1109   39.   Kycler, W.L., P. (2011). Surgical approach to pulmonary metastases from breast

1110   cancer. The Breast Journal *18*, 52-57.

1111   40.   Makhmut, A., Qin, D., Hartlmayr, D., Seth, A., and Coscia, F. (2024). An Automated

1112   and   Fast   Sample   Preparation   Workflow   for   Laser   Microdissection   Guided

Ultrasensitive Proteomics. Mol Cell Proteomics *23*, 100750.

10.1016/j.mcpro.2024.100750.

41.   Petrosius, V., Aragon-Fernandez, P., Arrey, T.N., Woessman, J., Uresin, N., de Boer,

B., Su, J., Furtwangler, B., Stewart, H., Denisov, E., et al. (2025). Quantitative Label-

Free Single-Cell Proteomics on the Orbitrap Astral MS. Mol Cell Proteomics, 100982.

10.1016/j.mcpro.2025.100982.

42.   Tashima, T., Nagatoishi, S., Caaveiro, J.M.M., Nakakido, M., Sagara, H., Kusano-Arai,

O., Iwanari, H., Mimuro, H., Hamakubo, T., Ohnuma, S.I., and Tsumoto, K. (2018).

Molecular basis for governing the morphology of type-I collagen fibrils by

Osteomodulin. Commun Biol *1*, 33. 10.1038/s42003-018-0038-2.

43.   Hamaya, E., Fujisawa, T., and Tamura, M. (2019). Osteoadherin serves roles in the

regulation of apoptosis and growth in MC3T3-E1 osteoblast cells. Int J Mol Med *44*,

2336-2344. 10.3892/ijmm.2019.4376.

44.   Tan, Y., Demeter, M.R., Ruan, H., and Comb, M.J. (2000). BAD Ser-155

Phosphorylation Regulates BAD/Bcl-XL Interaction and Cell Survival *. Journal of

Biological Chemistry *275*, 25865-25869. 10.1074/jbc.M004199200.

45.   Lin, W., Zhu, X., Gao, L., Mao, M., Gao, D., and Huang, Z. (2021). Osteomodulin

positively regulates osteogenesis through interaction with BMP2. Cell Death Dis *12*,

147. 10.1038/s41419-021-03404-5.

46.   Giorello, M.B., Martinez, L.M., Borzone, F.R., Padin, M.D.R., Mora, M.F., Sevic, I.,

Alaniz, L., Calcagno, M.L., Garcia-Rivello, H., Wernicke, A., et al. (2023). CD105

expression in cancer-associated fibroblasts: a biomarker for bone metastasis in early

invasive ductal breast cancer patients. Front Cell Dev Biol *11*, 1250869.

10.3389/fcell.2023.1250869.

47.   Katsuno, Y., Hanyu, A., Kanda, H., Ishikawa, Y., Akiyama, F., Iwase, T., Ogata, E.,

Ehata, S., Miyazono, K., and Imamura, T. (2008). Bone morphogenetic protein

signaling enhances invasion and bone metastasis of breast cancer cells through Smad

pathway. Oncogene *27*, 6322-6333. 10.1038/onc.2008.232.

48.   Sloan, E.K., Pouliot, N., Stanley, K.L., Chia, J., Moseley, J.M., Hards, D.K., and

Anderson, R.L. (2006). Tumor-specific expression of alphavbeta3 integrin promotes

spontaneous metastasis of breast cancer to bone. Breast Cancer Res *8*, R20.

10.1186/bcr1398.

49.   Mirzakhanyan, Y., Jankevics, A., Scheltema, R.A., and Gershon, P.D. (2023).

Combination of deep XLMS with deep learning reveals an ordered rearrangement and

assembly of a major protein component of the vaccinia virion. mBio *14*, e0113523.

10.1128/mbio.01135-23.

50.   Muller, M., Grabnitz, F., Barandun, N., Shen, Y., Wendt, F., Steiner, S.N., Severin, Y.,

Vetterli, S.U., Mondal, M., Prudent, J.R., et al. (2021). Light-mediated discovery of

surfaceome nanoscale organization and intercellular receptor interaction networks.

Nat Commun *12*, 7036. 10.1038/s41467-021-27280-x.

51.   Ninomiya, K., Miyamoto, T., Imai, J., Fujita, N., Suzuki, T., Iwasaki, R., Yagi, M.,

Watanabe, S., Toyama, Y., and Suda, T. (2007). Osteoclastic activity induces

osteomodulin expression in osteoblasts. Biochem Biophys Res Commun *362*, 460-

466. 10.1016/j.bbrc.2007.07.193.

52.   Rehn, A.P., Cerny, R., Sugars, R.V., Kaukua, N., and Wendel, M. (2008).

Osteoadherin is upregulated by mature osteoblasts and enhances their in vitro

differentiation and mineralization. Calcif Tissue Int *82*, 454-464. 10.1007/s00223-008-

9138-1.

53.   Qiao, M., Shapiro, P., Fosbrink, M., Rus, H., Kumar, R., and Passaniti, A. (2006). Cell

cycle-dependent phosphorylation of the RUNX2 transcription factor by cdc2 regulates

endothelial cell proliferation. J Biol Chem *281*, 7118-7128. 10.1074/jbc.M508162200.

54.   Rajgopal, A., Young, D.W., Mujeeb, K.A., Stein, J.L., Lian, J.B., van Wijnen, A.J., and

Stein, G.S. (2007). Mitotic control of RUNX2 phosphorylation by both CDK1/cyclin B

kinase and PP1/PP2A phosphatase in osteoblastic cells. J Cell Biochem *100*, 1509-

1517. 10.1002/jcb.21137.

55.   Li, X.Q., Lu, J.T., Tan, C.C., Wang, Q.S., and Feng, Y.M. (2016). RUNX2 promotes
1169   breast cancer bone metastasis by increasing integrin alpha5-mediated colonization.
1170   Cancer Lett *380*, 78-86. 10.1016/j.canlet.2016.06.007.

1171   56.   Ran, R., Harrison, H., Syamimi Ariffin, N., Ayub, R., Pegg, H.J., Deng, W., Mastro, A.,
1172   Ottewell, P.D., Mason, S.M., Blyth, K., et al. (2020). A role for CBFbeta in maintaining
1173   the metastatic phenotype of breast cancer cells. Oncogene *39*, 2624-2637.
1174   10.1038/s41388-020-1170-2.

1175   57.   Jones, M.C., Askari, J.A., Humphries, J.D., and Humphries, M.J. (2018). Cell adhesion
1176   is regulated by CDK1 during the cell cycle. Journal of Cell Biology *217*, 3203-3218.
1177   10.1083/jcb.201802088.

1178   58.   Ratnayake, W.S., Apostolatos, C.A., Breedy, S., Dennison, C.L., Hill, R., and Acevedo-
1179   Duncan, M. (2021). Atypical PKCs activate Vimentin to facilitate prostate cancer cell
1180   motility and invasion. Cell Adh Migr *15*, 37-57. 10.1080/19336918.2021.1882782.

1181   59.   Li, M., He, F., Zhang, Z., Xiang, Z., and Hu, D. (2020). CDK1 serves as a potential
1182   prognostic biomarker and target for lung cancer. J Int Med Res *48*, 300060519897508.
1183   10.1177/0300060519897508.

1184   60.   Ravindran Menon, D., Luo, Y., Arcaroli, J.J., Liu, S., KrishnanKutty, L.N., Osborne,
1185   D.G., Li, Y., Samson, J.M., Bagby, S., Tan, A.C., et al. (2018). CDK1 Interacts with
1186   Sox2 and Promotes Tumor Initiation in Human Melanoma. Cancer Res *78*, 6561-6574.
1187   10.1158/0008-5472.Can-18-0330.

1188   61.   Zheng, H.P., Huang, Z.G., He, R.Q., Lu, H.P., Dang, Y.W., Lin, P., Wen, D.Y., Qin,
1189   Y.Y., Luo, B., Li, X.J., et al. (2019). Integrated assessment of CDK1 upregulation in
1190   thyroid cancer. Am J Transl Res *11*, 7233-7254.

1191   62.   Wu, C.X., Wang, X.Q., Chok, S.H., Man, K., Tsang, S.H.Y., Chan, A.C.Y., Ma, K.W.,
1192   Xia, W., and Cheung, T.T. (2018). Blocking CDK1/PDK1/β-Catenin signaling by CDK1
1193   inhibitor RO3306 increased the efficacy of sorafenib treatment by targeting cancer
1194   stem cells in a preclinical model of hepatocellular carcinoma. Theranostics *8*, 3737-
1195   3750. 10.7150/thno.25487.

1196   63.   Paraghamian, S.E., Huang, Y., Hawkins, G.M., Fan, Y., Yin, Y., Zhang, X., Suo, H.,

1197   Zhou, C., and Bae-Jump, V.L. (2020). The Cdk1 inhibitor RO3306 has anti-tumorigenic

1198   effects in high-grade serous ovarian cancer. Gynecologic Oncology *159*, 88-89.

1199   10.1016/j.ygyno.2020.05.068.

1200   64.   Wang, Q., Bode, A.M., and Zhang, T. (2023). Targeting CDK1 in cancer: mechanisms

1201   and implications. NPJ Precis Oncol *7*, 58. 10.1038/s41698-023-00407-7.

1202   65.   Ji, H., Wang, J., Nika, H., Hawke, D., Keezer, S., Ge, Q., Fang, B., Fang, X., Fang, D.,

1203   Litchfield, D.W., et al. (2009). EGF-induced ERK activation promotes CK2-mediated

1204   disassociation of alpha-Catenin from beta-Catenin and transactivation of beta-Catenin.

1205   Mol Cell *36*, 547-559. 10.1016/j.molcel.2009.09.034.

1206   66.   Kang, Y., Siegel, P.M., Shu, W., Drobnjak, M., Kakonen, S.M., Cordón-Cardo, C.,

1207   Guise, T.A., and Massagué, J. (2003). A multigenic program mediating breast cancer

1208   metastasis to bone. Cancer Cell *3*, 537-549. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1535-

1209   6108(03)00132-6.

1210   67.   Holliday, D.L., Brouilette, K.T., Markert, A., Gordon, L.A., and Jones, J.L. (2009). Novel

1211   multicellular organotypic models of normal and malignant breast: tools for dissecting

1212   the role of the microenvironment in breast cancer progression. Breast Cancer Res *11*,

1213   R3. 10.1186/bcr2218.

1214   68.   Kojima, Y., Acar, A., Eaton, E.N., Mellody, K.T., Scheel, C., Ben-Porath, I., Onder, T.T.,

1215   Wang, Z.C., Richardson, A.L., Weinberg, R.A., and Orimo, A. (2010). Autocrine TGF-

1216   beta and stromal cell-derived factor-1 (SDF-1) signaling drives the evolution of tumor-

1217   promoting mammary stromal myofibroblasts. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *107*, 20009-

1218   20014. 10.1073/pnas.1013805107.

1219   69.   Collin-Osdoby, P., and Osdoby, P. (2012). RANKL-Mediated Osteoclast Formation

1220   from Murine RAW 264.7 cells. In Bone Research Protocols, M.H. Helfrich, and S.H.

1221   Ralston, eds. (Humana Press), pp. 187-202. 10.1007/978-1-61779-415-5_13.

1222   70.   Wilcock, D.J., Badrock, A.P., Wong, C.W., Owen, R., Guerin, M., Southam, A.D.,

1223   Johnston, H., Telfer, B.A., Fullwood, P., Watson, J., et al. (2022). Oxidative stress from

DGAT1 oncoprotein inhibition in melanoma suppresses tumor growth when ROS

defenses are also breached. Cell Rep *39*, 110995. 10.1016/j.celrep.2022.110995.

71. Cox, J., and Mann, M. (2008). MaxQuant enables high peptide identification rates,

individualized p.p.b.-range mass accuracies and proteome-wide protein quantification.

Nat Biotechnol *26*, 1367-1372. 10.1038/nbt.1511.

72. Tyanova, S., Temu, T., Sinitcyn, P., Carlson, A., Hein, M.Y., Geiger, T., Mann, M., and

Cox, J. (2016). The Perseus computational platform for comprehensive analysis of

(prote)omics data. Nat Methods *13*, 731-740. 10.1038/nmeth.3901.

73. Szklarczyk, D., Gable, A.L., Lyon, D., Junge, A., Wyder, S., Huerta-Cepas, J.,

Simonovic, M., Doncheva, N.T., Morris, J.H., Bork, P., et al. (2019). STRING v11:

protein-protein association networks with increased coverage, supporting functional

discovery in genome-wide experimental datasets. Nucleic Acids Res *47*, D607-D613.

10.1093/nar/gky1131.

74. Kohl, M., Wiese, S., and Warscheid, B. (2011). Cytoscape: software for visualization

and analysis of biological networks. Methods Mol Biol *696*, 291-303. 10.1007/978-1-

60761-987-1_18.

75. Schneider, C.A., Rasband, W.S., and Eliceiri, K.W. (2012). NIH Image to ImageJ: 25

years of image analysis. Nat Methods *9*, 671-675. 10.1038/nmeth.2089.

76. Bankhead, P., Loughrey, M.B., Fernandez, J.A., Dombrowski, Y., McArt, D.G., Dunne,

P.D., McQuaid, S., Gray, R.T., Murray, L.J., Coleman, H.G., et al. (2017). QuPath:

Open source software for digital pathology image analysis. Sci Rep *7*, 16878.

10.1038/s41598-017-17204-5.

77. Ritchie, M.E., Phipson, B., Wu, D., Hu, Y., Law, C.W., Shi, W., and Smyth, G.K. (2015).

limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray

studies. Nucleic Acids Res *43*, e47. 10.1093/nar/gkv007.

78. Wu, S.Z., Al-Eryani, G., Roden, D.L., Junankar, S., Harvey, K., Andersson, A.,

Thennavan, A., Wang, C., Torpy, J.R., Bartonicek, N., et al. (2021). A single-cell and

spatially resolved atlas of human breast cancers. Nat Genet *53*, 1334-1347.

10.1038/s41588-021-00911-1.

1253

A

monocyte
macrophage
myeloid cell
memory B cell
plasmablast naive B cell
luminal epithelial cell
mammary gland
fibroblast of epithelial cell T cell
breast
basal-myoepithelial CD8-positive,
cell alpha-beta T cell
pericyte endothelial cell
of lymphatic vessel
CD4-positive,
alpha-beta T cell
mature NK T cell
natural killer cell
endothelial cell
100,064 cells from 26 samples
Wu *et al*., 2021

B

OMD
3.5
3
2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
0

C

Human OMD Concentration (ng/mL)

300
200
100
0

231-OMD   544R

D

Wound density
(%post-scratch
compared to time 0)

150
100
50
0

ns

1000 ng/mL   544R
rOMD   CM

231-mA

F

Wound density
(%post-scratch
compared to time 0)

150
100
50
0

ns

1000 ng/mL   544R
rOMD   CM

MCF-7

E

231-mA

1000 ng/mL rOMD   544R CM

1mm

G

MCF-7

1000 ng/mL rOMD   544R CM

1mm