Licochalcone A from licorice reprograms metabolic and antioxidant pathways in the breast leading to a tumor preventive environment.

Atieh Hajirahimkhan[1][*], Elizabeth T. Bartom[2], Sriram Chandrasekaran[3], Ruohui Chen[4], Susan E. Clare[1], Seema A. Khan[1].

[1]Division of Breast Surgery, Robert H. Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL., [2]The Louis A. Simpson and Kimberly K. Querrey Biomedical Research Center, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL., [3]Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI., [4]Department of Preventive Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL.

*Corresponding author: Atieh Hajirahimkhan, PhD

Division of Breast Surgery

Robert H. Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center

Northwestern University

303 E. Superior, 4-220, Chicago, IL. USA

atieh.hajirahimkhan@northwestern.edu

Abstract (350 words limit).

Several anti-estrogen drugs are proven to reduce breast cancer risk, but have had minimal acceptance and impact, due to their side effects. Additionally, these do not reduce the risk of estrogen receptor negative breast cancer. Candidate drugs that are under investigation for this purpose have unfavorable tolerability and safety profiles. Licochalcone A (LicA) from licorice is a prenylated chalcone which has antioxidant and anti-inflammatory effects, suppresses aromatase expression and activity, and reduces estrogen genotoxic metabolism in vivo. We evaluated its breast cancer preventive potential using microstructures obtained from mastectomy specimens of high-risk postmenopausal women. We treated these *ex-vivo* with LicA, followed by total RNA sequencing, differential gene expression and pathway analysis, followed by metabolic flux modeling. We observed profound downregulation of SREBF-dependent cholesterol biosynthesis, lipid metabolism, and PI3K-Akt pathways, along with significant upregulation of NRF2-dependent antioxidant and anti NF-kB-dependent inflammatory pathways. Additionally, NAD(P)H regenerating pentose phosphate shunt which supports these defense mechanisms was upregulated, in a direction unfavorable to nucleotide biosynthesis and proliferation. Drug matrix analysis of LicA-treated samples revealed significant transcriptomic similarities with statins. NanoString metabolism panel evaluations in microstructures from additional subjects confirmed these findings. Live cell imaging on 2 pre-malignant and 5 malignant breast cell lines treated with single and repeated doses of LicA showed antiproliferation, consistent with the downregulation of proliferative markers (SP1 and KLF4). Western blot analysis demonstrated suppression of SREBP1 in ER+ and ER- malignant breast cells and suppression of p-PI3K and p-AKT in cancer cells suggesting associations with antiproliferative efficacy of LicA. In vivo studies with subcutaneous LicA showed significant suppression of both luminal and triple negative xenografts in mice. Our data suggest that LicA reprograms metabolism and antioxidant responses, and is a promising candidate for further

43   studies as a breast cancer risk reducing agent. Future studies with oral LicA in models of breast

44   cancer prevention are warranted.

45   **Key words:** Anti-inflammation, antioxidant, breast cancer prevention, licochalcone A, natural

46   products, metabolism

Introduction

Current recommendations for breast cancer prevention interventions are based on estimates of risk in individual women. For women at markedly increased risk (10-fold) such as those with high-penetrance germline mutations, risk-reducing bilateral mastectomy can be considered. However, for the vast majority of at-risk women, with risk estimates in the 1.5-4-fold range, risk reducing medications are recommended. At present the only risk reduction drugs available for breast cancer are anti-estrogens; aromatase inhibitors (AIs; exemestane and anastrozole) for postmenopausal women and selective estrogen receptor modulators (SERMs) such as tamoxifen for pre and postmenopausal women. These drugs can lower the risk of estrogen receptor positive (ER+) breast cancer by 50-65% [1]. However, of the estimated 2 million U.S. women who could benefit from these medications more than 85% decline them, mainly due to their adverse effects: vasomotor symptoms, thrombogenesis/stroke, bone loss, and endometrial cancer [1-6]. In addition, these risk reducing drugs do not protect against estrogen receptor negative (ER-) breast cancer. One of the abnormally active pathways in precancer lesions including atypical hyperplasia is PI3K-AKT. It is posited that PI3K pathway inhibitors such as everolimus and alpelisib might have the potential to be repurposed for ER- and ER+ breast cancer prevention [7-9]; however, their side effects such as hyperglycemia are a major impediment [10]. Therefore, there is a clear need to have alternative agents with sufficient efficacy, minimal adverse effects, and greater acceptance.

Studies have shown that metabolic dysregulation and obesity are associated with the elevated risk of pre and postmenopausal breast cancers; ER+ disease in post-menopausal women and ER- breast cancer in those who are premenopausal [11-16]. This enhanced risk is related to several factors such as increases in breast adiposity, oxidative stress, inflammation, aromatase expression and activity, altered adipokine secretion, and extracellular matrix remodeling [17-21].

Inflammation particularly in white adipose tissue has been frequently posited as the key element

connecting adipogenesis to breast cancer development. An inflamed environment supports the

growth of malignant cells through recruitment of macrophages, secretion of inflammatory

cytokines, enhancing fatty acid oxidation, formation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), and

increased proliferation [21]. Existing data reveal that blocking inflammation might reduce the risk

of breast cancer and that the inflammation can be tempered through activation of NRF2

dependent antioxidant pathways. This mechanism also leads to up-regulation of detoxification

enzymes that deter cancer initiation [22, 23]. Moreover, in the absence of active antioxidant/anti-

inflammatory thioredoxin system, adipogenesis, dysregulated lipid metabolism, and fat

deposition are particularly enhanced [13, 24-27]. To that end, the activity of master regulators of

lipid metabolism such as sterol regulatory element binding protein 1 (SREBP1) have been

shown to have prognostic value in breast cancer progression, and are associated with

mechanical cues of breast carcinogenesis such as extracellular matrix (ECM) stiffness [28, 29].

Studies have shown the protective effect of bariatric surgery against breast cancer through

minimizing the mass of dysfunctional adipose tissue, and have also posited that small

molecules interfering with the effects of adipokines might have protective effects against breast

cancer [30, 31]. In addition, epidemiological data suggest the lower risk of breast cancer

recurrence in women taking statins, although their effect on primary prevention of breast cancer

is not clear [32]. Collectively, interventions that work through blockade of the axis of

metabolism-inflammation-extracellular matrix remodeling-proliferation appear to be protective

against breast cancer through reversing several hallmarks of cancer without exering deleterious

endocrine responses that are the concern with presently available risk reduction drugs [33].

We have identified licochalcone A (LicA) from a specific species of licorice as a candidate for

further studies with the goal of developing an efficacious non-endocrine risk reducing

medication with minimal toxicity, and significantly better acceptance. It has been shown that

LicA has antioxidant and anti-inflammatory effects [34-46]. We have observed that LicA inhibits

aromatase (CYP19A1), the rate limiting enzyme in estrogen biosynthesis and the target of AIs

used for breast cancer prevention [35]. In addition, LicA blocks estrogen carcinogenic

metabolism through the downregulation of CYP1B1, in vivo [39]. LicA has also been reported to

releive conditions such as arthritis, mastitis, acute lung injury through anti-inflammatory

pathways, and has been suggested to have osteoprotective effects [42, 43, 46-48]. Anti-

inflammatory effects of LicA could be partly explained by its binding to KEAP1 which can

simultanously enhance NRF2-dependent antioxidant effects while suppressing inflammation

[23]. In the current study, we confirm these findings in breast tissue microstructures from women

at high risk of breast cancer and in seven premalignant and malignant breast cell lines. We

show how LicA modulates NRF2 and thioredoxin system, SREBP dependent cholesterol

homeostasis and lipid metabolism, metabolic flux to support such effects in these models, and

how such properties lead to antiproliferative effects in vitro and in vivo. Based on these results

and existing literature, we conclude that LicA is an excellent candidate for breast cancer

prevention in women at increased risk, through reprogramming antioxidant and metabolic

pathways, and is highly likely to be safe and well-tolerated.

Materials and Methods

Chemicals and Materials. All chemicals and reagents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St.

Louis, MO), unless otherwise indicated. MammoCult media kit, heparin, and hydrocortisone

were purchased from Stem Cell Technologies (Vancouver, BC. Canada). F12-K nutrient mix

(Kaighn's) medium was acquired from Gibco (Dublin, Ireland). Fetal bovine serum (FBS) was

purchased from Atlanta Biologicals (Norcross, GA). Collagenase I was purchased from Sigma-

Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). Licochalcone A (LicA) was acquired from Med Chem Express

(Monmouth Junction, NJ). Direct-Zol RNA prep kit was acquired from Zymoresearch (Irvine,

CA). TRIzol was obtained from Invitrogen (Waltham, MA). RNA concentration and clean up kit

was acquired from Norgen Biotek (ON, Canada). KAPA RNA HyperPrep library preparation kit was obtained from Roche (Madison, WI). Unique dual adaptors for next generation sequencing (NGS) and PCR reagents, primers, and master mix were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies (Coralville, IA). Antibodies were obtained from Abcam (Cambridge, UK). Western blot reagents, buffers, supplies were purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific (Hanover Park, IL.).

Cell Culture. We grew pre-malignant DCIS.COM and malignant MCF-7 and MDA-MB-231 cells (all obtained from ATCC) in RPMI-1640 supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% penicillin/streptomycin (Invitrogen Thermo Fisher Scientific, Hanover Park, IL.). We also grew pre-malignant DCIS.COM/ER+ PR+ cells obtained from Dr. Dean Edwards's laboratory (Baylor College of Medicine) [49] in DMEM/F12 supplemented with 10% horse serum, 0.5% penicillin/streptomycin, and 1% HEPES. In addition, we acquired MCF-7 cells overexpressing aromatase (MCF-7aro) from Dr. Shiuan Chen's laboratory (City of Hope) [50] and grew them in MEM supplemented with 10% FBS, 2 mM L-glutamine, 1 mM sodium pyruvate, 1% nonessential amino acids, and 1 U/mL penicillin/streptomycin. BRCA defective malignant breast cell lines HCC-1937 and HCC-3153 were obtained from Dr. Gazdar's group (University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center) and were grown in RPMI-1640 supplemented with 5% FBS and 1% penicillin/streptomycin.

Human breast microstructure preparation and treatment. To prepare breast microstructures the protocol of Brisken's group was used with some minor modifications [51, 52]. The unaffected contralateral breast tissues of postmenopausal women who underwent bilateral mastectomy due to incident unilateral breast cancer were obtained while fresh, and diced to approximately 5 mm pieces before digesting at 37°C with 2% collagenase I in F12-K nutrient mix (Kaighn's) medium, overnight. After the completion of digestion, the tissue was centrifuged at 250 x g for 5 min and the supernatant was discarded. The pellet was washed with phosphate buffered saline

and was mixed and cultured in MammoCult media supplemented with 0.2% heparin and 0.5%

hydrocortisone. After 24 h incubation at 37°C the treatments were mixed with fresh MammoCult

media and added to the microstructures. **Ethics declarations:** Institutional Review Board (IRB)

approval (IRB STU00202331) was obtained from Northwestern University prior to obtaining

informed consents from patients and collecting samples. All experiments were conducted in

accordance with the approved protocol and guidelines.

RNA sequencing. After 24 h incubation with LicA (5 µM) or DMSO, the microstructure

pellets obtained from 6 subjects were prepared and washed with HBSS. Trizol was

added to each pellet and the protocol of Direct-Zol RNA prep kit was used to extract

RNA. The protocol included a step of DNAse I treatment for removing DNA

contamination of the RNA preparations. RNA was eluted in nuclease free water and

quality assessment was performed using Agilent Bioanalyzer and Qubit. Libraries were made

using Roche KAPA Biosystems protocol (KAPA RNA Hyper Prep Kit Technical Data Sheet,

KR1352 – v4.17, Roche Corporate) and the quality was evaluated. Total RNA sequencing was

performed with Illumina NovaSeq 6000 v1.5, 2x100 b, paired end with 40 million reading depth,

followed by quality assessment using FASTQC, alignment to reference genome hg38, raw data

processing using STAR, and data analysis to define differential gene expression, as described

previously [53-55]. Significantly (adj P < 0.05) modulated genes were further analyzed with

Enrichr to define highly modulated pathways.

NanoString metabolism panel. We treated six additional subjects' breast microstructures with

LicA (5 µM) or DMSO for 24 h. After extracting RNA and quality assessment we used the

NanoString nCounter Metabolism Panel (NanoString Technologies Inc.) to quantify RNA

expression from 749 genes. Differentially expressed genes and pathway analysis were

determined using ROSALIND platform (ROSALIND, Inc.) with normalization, fold changes (≥ 1.5

fold: upregulated or ≤ -1.5 fold: downregulated), and adjusted p-value < 0.05 using the

Benjamini-Hochberg method.

Genome-scale metabolic network modeling and flux based analysis (FBA). We calculated

the relative activity of reactions in breast microstructures of 6 women by interpreting gene

expression data using the Recon1 human metabolic model outlined in Shen et al [56-58]. We

then identified a metabolic flux state that is most consistent with gene expression data in control

and LicA treated samples. This was achieved by maximizing the activity of reactions that are

associated with upregulated genes and minimizing flux through reactions that are

downregulated in a condition, while simultaneously satisfying the stoichiometric and

thermodynamic constraints embedded in the model using linear optimization [56-58]. The

glucose, fatty acid, and glutamine levels in the simulations were adjusted based on the growth

media used for culturing the cells. All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons.

Proliferation assay. We seeded pre-malignant DCIS.COM and DCIS.COM/ER+ PR+ cell lines

as well as malignant MCF-7 (ER+ PR+), MDA-MB-231 (ER- PR-), MCF-7aro (ER+ PR+), HCC-

1937 (ER- PR-, BRCA1 mutated), and HCC-3153 (ER- PR-, BRCA mutated1) cells with the

density of 2.5 x 10^3 cells/well in their appropriate media in 96-well plates. We placed the plate in

IncuCyte instrument for continued live cell imaging every 6 h. When cells reached 30%

confluency, eight different concentrations of LicA ranging from 350 nM to 40 µM were added to

the designated wells. We added comparable dilutions of DMSO to the wells allocated for vehicle

control. In the case of MCF-7aro cells which overexpress *cyp19a1* (aromatase), the dosing of

LicA or DMSO was performed in the presence of androstenedione, the substrate for aromatase.

We continued live cell imaging for a minimum of 4 days post treatment. When we found out that

a single low dose is not sufficient for sustained antiproliferation, we added the treatment and

control every 48 h for 6 days and continued live cell imaging for a maximum of 12 days. Data

was analyzed using Zoom software to quantify the images and were plotted as mean ± SEM of

at least two independent measurements.

Western Blot. The Western blot analysis was performed as described before [36]. After 48 h

treatment of each compound, the cells were lysed with RIPA buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5,

0.1% SDS, 1% Triton X-100, 150 mM NaCl, 0.5% Sodium deoxycholate, and 2 mM EDTA)

containing protease/phosphatase inhibitor cocktail (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA,

USA) at 4°C for 1 h. The supernatants were collected and quantified using BCA protein assay

kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to the manufacturer's instructions. To identify the

molecular weight, we used regular range protein marker and precision plus protein dual color

standard marker. Protein of 10–12 µg was loaded on 4–12% sodium dodecyl sulfate

polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE), and then transferred to polyvinylidene

difluoride membrane. The membranes were blocked with TBS-T buffer (Tris-buffered saline

containing 0.1% Tween 20) containing 5% (w/v) skim milk powder for 1 h at 25°C, and then

incubated with primary antibodies for 18 h at 4°C. After incubation with the secondary HRP-

linked antibody for 1 h at 25°C, the membranes was detected using Clarity™ Western ECL

Blotting Substrates (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA).

In vivo studies. Female ovary intact athymic nude mice were purchased from Jackson

Laboratory at 6 weeks of age. Animals were acclimated for a week upon arrival and then were

subcutaneously (s.c.) inoculated in flanks with either MCF-7 cells (1 million cells/animal, 12

animals) or MDA-MB-231 (1 million cells/animal, 18 animals). After the xenograft tumors

reached the palpable size of 0.8 cm in diameter, the daily administration (s.c) of LicA (80

mg/kg.day) or vehicle (4% DMSO, 6% EtOH + 45% water + 45% PEG-400) was started and

continued until day 28 after the first dose. Animals were weighed once per week and the tumor

size was measured twice per week using a digital caliper. The size of tumors were calculated

using the formula [Tumor volume = (A^2) x B/2] with "A" representing the small diameter and "B"

representing the large diameter of the tumor. The tumor volume was plotted for each animal

every time the tumor was measured. The growth of tumors in animals treated with LicA was

compared with growth of tumors in the animals receiving the vehicle control. After the

completion of the treatments, animals were sacrificed and the tumors were harvested, weighed,

and preserved for future studies. It should be noted that if an animal met any humane endpoint

criteria before the completion of the treatment course, as per the IACUC protocol, we sacrificed

the animal. ***Ethics declaration:*** All the in vivo studies and procedures were performed under

the approved Northwestern University IACUC protocol # IS00013602.

Statistical analysis. The regular ordinary least square regression (eg. simple linear regression)

does not consider heterogeneity across groups or time. Therefore, we fit linear model using

generalized least squares (GLS) to compare the tumor size trend over time between groups

using LicA and vehicle for MDA-MB-231 and MCF-7 xenografts. We also compared the

marginal tumor size between groups using LicA and vehicle for MDA-MB-231 and MCF-7

xenografts through least-squares means. We compared different variance-covariance

structures, through ANOVA and selected the best fitted model with the smallest AIC.

Results

Licochalcone A facilitates metabolic regulation at the transcriptional level in breast

microstructures from high-risk postmenopausal women.

We exposed microstructures obtained from fresh surgical breast tissue of 6 postmenopausal

women to LicA (5 µM) or DMSO for 24 h and conducted total RNA-seq. The analysis showed

that LicA produces a transcriptional profile that is very different from that of DMSO in each

subject's tissue specimens. Differential gene expression analysis showed that in LicA treated

samples 2341 genes were downregulated (adj $P < 0.05$) with 381 genes having logFC < -1.

Down-regulated genes include *HMGCR*, *MVD*, *MVK*, *SQLE*, *ACAT2*, *SREBF1*, *SREBF2*,

INSIG1, *LSS*, *PTGST*, *RELA*, *ALDH1A3*, *SERPINB2*, *Wnt*, and *CYP1B1*. Additionally, in these

samples, a total of 1462 genes were upregulated (adj P < 0.05) with 538 genes having logFC >

1. Genes associated with the upregulated pathways include *NQO1*, *NQO2*, *HMOX1*, *GST*s,

TXN, *TXNRD1*, *SLC*s, *G6PD*, and *GCLC*. Pathway enrichment analysis of the differentially

expressed genes induced by LicA (5 μM) was performed and the top down-regulated, and up-

regulated pathways are shown in Fig 1A and Fig 1B and the associated supplementary data

(S1A and S1B). The analyses shown in Fig 1A and Fig S1A revealed that metabolic pathways

including lipids and cholesterol metabolism and biosynthesis, PI3K-Akt signaling, and pathways

involved in inflammatory response are among the top downregulated processes. In contrast as

demonstrated in Fig 1B and Fig S1B, NRF2 dependent antioxidant pathways, pentose

phosphate pathway, glutathione metabolism, suppression of EGFR signaling, and ferroptosis

were among the top upregulated pathways. Transcription factor analysis (Fig 1C) revealed that

the profoundly upregulated transcription factor in LicA treated microstructures is NRF2 which is

consistent with our previous findings [36] and the significantly down regulated transcription

factors in these samples are proliferative factors SP1 and KLF4, inflammation transcription

factor NFkB and its subunit RELA, and the pro-adipogenic transcription factor sterol regulatory

element binding factor (SREBF) 1 and SREBF2. Further analysis using Drug Matrix geneset

and MAGMA Drug showed profound similarities in both upregulated and downregulated gene

signatures between LicA and several statins such as simvastatin, atorvastatin, and lovastatin

(Fig 1D).

To validate the sequencing results, breast microstructures from 6 additional subjects were

obtained. NanoString metabolism panel consisting of 749 metabolic genes was employed and

the results were analyzed using ROSALIND software. The data demonstrated significant (P <

0.05) downregulation of up to 3.5 fold change in *ACAT2*, *CYP1B1*, *L2HGDH*, *ACY1*, *SREBF2*,

NRF1, *AR*, *PLA2G15*, *AKT2*, and *NDC1* expression and significant (P < 0.05) upregulation of up

to 1.9 fold change in *SLC7A11*, *GCLC*, *TXNRD1* expression (Fig 2). The analysis also showed

that pathways associated with cholesterol homeostasis, mTORC1 signaling, reactive oxygen

species metabolism, and heme metabolism were significantly modulated (adj P < 0.03).

Licochalcone A changes flux through metabolic pathways to facilitate support for

antioxidant effects, reduced lipids and cholesterol biosynthesis, and reduced

proliferation. Further analysis of the sequencing data in the first 6 high-risk women's tissue

microstructures was performed to define flux through metabolic pathways using genome-scale

metabolic modeling (Figure 3) [59, 60]. The analysis showed that flux through 191 reactions

were significantly ($p < 0.05$) modulated as a function of exposure to LicA. Some of the top

modulated metabolic reactions are key steps in glycolysis/gluconeogenesis, nucleotide

biosynthesis and catabolism, pentose phosphate shunt, pyruvate metabolism, cholesterol

metabolism, fatty acid elongation, and steroid metabolism (Figure 3A). Interestingly, when the

results were further explored at the metabolic reaction levels using BIGG database [61], the

direction of the flux for many reactions had changed in favor of generating excess NAD(P)H and

creating a reducing/antioxidant environment. Examples of these reactions were aldehyde

dehydrogenase in glycolysis/gluconeogenesis, glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase and

phosphogluconate dehydrogenase in pentose phosphate shunt, 17-beta hydroxysteroid

dehydrogenase in steroid metabolism, and methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase in folate

metabolism (Figure 3B). In particular, flux through the NADPH generating oxidative branch of

PPP which is irreversible with G6PD as the rate determining enzyme, was significantly

increased (Figure 3C). Flux through the non-oxidative branch of PPP which is reversible with

TALA as the rate determining enzyme had changed towards generating more ribose 5

phosphate (R5P) too (Figure 3C). However, flux through PRPPS responsible for nucleotide

biosynthesis was not in favor of PRPP generation; rather the production of R5P was favored

(Figure 3C). In addition, flux through PPM which is involved in nucleotide catabolism was in

favor of consuming R5P and generating more R1P. Formation of R1P supports efficient

recycling of nucleotides for DNA repair or energetics, as opposed to R5P formation essential for

nucleotide de novo biosynthesis and cell proliferation. This was further confirmed when we

followed overall nucleotide flux in these samples and observed the dominance of salvage

nucleotide biosynthesis process and its connection to antioxidant reactions such as NADPH-

dependent formation of reduced thioredoxin (Figure 3D). This is clearer when we see that the

formation of ADP-ribose from AMP and R5P is favored over the formation of R5P which can

lead to reduced proliferation (Figure 3B and 3D). Similarly, we observed that flux through

several reactions in cholesterol metabolism such as 4-methyl zymosterol, 24-dehydrocholesterol

reductase, 7-dehydrocholesterol reductase, lathosterol oxidase, cholesterol efflux, and several

cholesterol transporters was in a direction to generate less cholesterol and excess NADPH

(Figure S2). These were consistent with differential gene expression results (Figure 1). In

addition, flux through fatty acid elongation reactions catalyzed by desaturase enzymes such as

stearyl CoA desaturase (SCD) were significantly modulated to enhance the ratio of saturated

versus monounsaturated fatty acids, and to generate excess NADPH, as a function of exposure

to LicA (Figure 3E).

Licochalcone A retards proliferation of pre-malignant and malignant breast cells. Our

transcriptomic and metabolic flux modeling studies suggested LicA has antioxidant/anti-

inflammatory effects along with lowered production of nucleotides for cell growth in medium-risk

women's breast tissues. These observations encouraged us to evaluate how and at what

concentration(s) LicA affects breast cell proliferation. We selected two pre-malignant breast

cells lines; DCIS.COM (ER- PR-) and DCIS.COM (ER+ PR+), and 5 malignant cell lines MCF-7

(ER+ PR+), MCF-7aro (ER+ PR+ overexpressing CYP19A1), MDA-MB-231 (ER- PR-),

HCC1937 (ER- PR-, BRCA1 mutation), and HCC3153 (ER- PR-, BRCA1 mutation). When we

exposed these cell lines to various concentrations (range of 1 µM – 40 µM) of LicA we observed

that a single dose at 20 µM or 40 µM was able to exert a sustained antiproliferation in

DCIS.COM and DCIS.COM/ER+ PR+ for at least 4 days post dosing (Figure 4). This

observation was true for MDA-MB-231 and MCF-7 cells, but they also responded to 10 µM of

LicA, although the antiproliferative effect at this dose was not sustained (Figure 4) when the

cells were treated once. In particular, MDA-MB-231 cells had a slowed growth rate initially, but

with time they could eventually catch up with vehicle-treated cells. These observations

encouraged us to test repeated dosing of LicA. When LicA administration was performed every

48 h for 6 days (3 dosing) we observed that MCF-7 cells continued to exhibit reduced

proliferation when exposed to LicA (10 µM) and the effect was sustained until day 12. This

observation was true for MCF-7aro cells, HCC1937, and HCC3153 cells which were very well

responsive to LicA (5 µM) (Figure 4). Interestingly, repeating treatment (10 µM) for MDA-MB-

231 cells for two times until day 4 was able to sustainably retard proliferation until day 11

(Figure 4). Our confirmatory BrdU assay showed no cytotoxicity and the use of ferroptosis

inhibitor, ferrostatin, in combination with LicA showed that the antiproliferative effects are not

due to ferroptosis (data not shown). The results of the proliferation experiments in breast cancer

cells were consistent with our observation that a number of micro RNAs important in

proliferation and progression of breast cancer including but not limited to miR-21, miR-21-5p,

miR-21-3p, miR-21a-5p, miR-106a-5p, miR-106b-5p, miR-20a-5p, miR-20b-5p, and miR-519c-

3p were downregulated, significantly (S3 table).

Regulation of PI3K-SREBP metabolic axis in MCF-7 and MDA-MB-231 cell lines. The

observed antiproliferative effects in ER+ and ER- breast cancer cell lines (Figure 4) with LicA

and the metabolic effects detected in women's breast tissue microstructures (Figure 1)

suggested that the antiproliferative effects could be associated with changes in the levels of

PI3K and SREBPs. Our western blot analysis in breast cancer cells (Figure 5) showed that LicA

consistently reduced the expression of p-PI3K, p-AKT, and of SREBP1 in MDA-MB-231 cells.

Interestingly, LicA did not reduce SREBP2 levels in both MCF-7 and MDA-MB-231 cells.

Licochalcone A retards luminal and triple negative xenograft tumors in mice.

Our proliferation studies with LicA in various breast cell lines (Figure 4) followed by the

observation of PI3K downregulation in ER+ cells and downregulation of SREBP1 in ER+ and

ER- breast cancer cells (Figure 5) encouraged us to further study LicA in xenograft animal

models of ER+ and ER- mammary cancers. In animals bearing MDA-MB-231 (ER-) xenografts,

daily treatment with LicA (80 mg/kg.day) for 28 days significantly (P < 0.000) reduced the

growth rate of tumors in a majority of the animals (Figure 6A). There were two animals (22%) in

LicA-treated group that did not exhibit responsiveness to LicA despite completing the treatment

course, and their tumor sizes continued to grow significantly. These two animals also showed

enhanced weight gain during the study while the rest of the animals remain within the expected

weight gain range (Figure 6A). Similarly, in the animals bearing MCF-7 xenograft tumors,

treatment with LicA lead to a significant (P < 0.005) reduction in the rate of tumor growth with a

relatively similar responsiveness to treatment (Figure 6B).

These results show that LicA regulates metabolism in breast tissue to control proliferation,

which can be employed for breast cancer prevention purpose.

Discussion

One of the hallmarks of cancer and an essential step in malignant transformation is metabolic

reprogramming; changes in cellular bioenergetics facilitating the high energy demand of

hyperproliferating cells and promoting their survival [33]. One of the main tools of this

mechanism is reprogramming lipid metabolic pathways [62-67]. Within this major pathway,

SREBF1 gene encodes SREBP1a and SREBP1c proteins which are transcription factors

regulating lipid metabolism. SREBF1 is significantly higher in breast tumors compared to normal

tissue adjacent to tumor and the healthy breast tissue in GTEx and TCGA datasets. Conversely,

downregulation of SREBP1 not only lowers adipogenesis, but is also associated with bone

protection [68-70]. It is known that SREBP1 regulates the expression of fatty acid synthase

(FASN), acetyl-CoA acetyltransferase 2 (ACAT2), acetyl CoA carboxylase 1 (ACC1), and ATP

citrate lyase (ACLY) which are essential for the survival of breast cancer cells [28, 71, 72].

There is also a strong association between breast tissue stiffness (a risk factor for breast

carcinogenesis) and SREBP1 activity [29, 73, 74]. Upstream of SREBF1, EGFR activation and

PI3K-Akt-mTOR mutation, as well as mTORC1 activity lead to enhanced SREBF1 expression

and consequent increase in SCD activity [75-79]. Reversing the activity of SCD, as shown with

SCD inhibitors, is particularly critical to maintain the higher levels of saturated fatty acids vs

monounsaturated fatty acids which is important in protecting cells against hyperproliferation,

tumorigenesis, migration, invasion, metastasis, and cancer cell stemness [80-82]. Our data

shows that in breast microstructures from women at moderately increased risk of breast cancer

(i,e, those who have experienced an initial breast malignancy and are at increased risk for a

second), LicA significantly lowered SREBF1, as well as the expression of several of its

upstream players such as EGFR, PI3K, Akt, and mTORC1, in addition to SCD which is

downstream of SREBF1. Further studies in MCF-7 and MDA-MB-231 breast cancer cells

showed their proliferation retardation as a function of exposure to LicA with reduced expression

of SREBP1 protein accompanied by the reduced expression of PI3K in MCF-7 cells. Although

the levels of PI3K did not reduce in MDA-MB-231 cells upon treatment with LicA, the profound

reduction in SREBP1 levels could be the mechanism of LicA's antiproliferative effects and its

tumor suppressive effects in the xenograft models of luminal and non-luminal mammary tumors.

Reduction of SREBP1 can be used as an opportunity for reducing mammary stiffness and the

risk of breast cancer.

Another important gene in lipid metabolism pathway is SREBF2 which encodes SREBP2

protein primarily regulating cholesterol biosynthesis and homeostasis [83]. It is known that

enhanced expression of SREBF2 promotes progression of several types of cancers [64, 84, 85].

SREBF2 is significantly higher in breast tumors compared to normal tissue adjacent to tumor

and healthy tissues in GTEx and TCGA samples. Among the genes that are regulated by

SREBP2 are members of the mevalonate pathway such as MVD, MVK, SQLN, and HMGCR.

The activity of SREBF2 is opposed by the major tumor suppressor P53 through transcriptional

upregulation of ABCA1 transporter and cholesterol efflux [83]. This effect is further reinforced by

the activation of LXR and its subsequent regulation of cholesterol homeostasis and ABCA1

mediated efflux, suppressing de novo biosynthesis, and uptake of cholesterol. In our study in

women's breast tissue (Figure 1) in addition to lowered SREBF2 expression, the effect of LicA

on mevalonate pathway resembles the effects exhibited by p53 and LXR activation. These

effects suggest that LicA reverses the oncogenic direction of EGFR-PI3K-Akt-SREBP axis in

non-malignant tissue, and thus can protect breast cells through reprogramming metabolism. Our

observations about SREBP2 in women's breast microstructures and malignant breast cell lines

MCF-7 and MDA-MB-231 are not similar which could be related to the fact that microstructures

resemble a mixture of various non-malignant cell types in breast tissue, as opposed to

malignant breast cell lines. Despite responsiveness to the tumor suppressive effects of LicA in

both MCF-7 and MDA-MB-231 xenografts the underlying mechanisms could be different,

although the downregulation of SREBP1 in both malignant cells and women's tissues can lead

us to a potential target. These results become more interesting when we see the significant

downregulation of SP1 and KLF4 dependent pathways, important in precancer lesion

proliferation and cancer cell stemness in women's breast microstructures treated with LicA [86].

In addition we observe that in these tissue preparations metabolism flux was not only in favor of

generating excess NADPH to support antioxidant pathways, it was also reprogrammed to

minimize generation of nucleotides necessary for cell proliferation; the effect that was later

confirmed by the dose and time-dependent antiproliferation data in a range of cell lines -

precancer ER+ and ER- DCIS like cells, ER+ and ER- breast cancer cells, ER+ breast cancer

cells overexpressing aromatase, and in BRCA deficient ER- breast cancer cells, as well as in

xenograft in vivo models.

Another important effect of LicA that happens in parallel to its metabolic and antiproliferative

responses is its role in limiting oxidative and inflammatory stress through the activity of NRF2

and thioredoxin dependent pathways in the breast tissue microstructures of medium-risk

women. Such stressors can cause DNA damage, remodel extracellular matrix, promote cancer

cell stemness, and modify paracrine effects to initiate and promote tumors [18, 21-23, 87, 88].

Overall, our data suggest that LicA protects against oxidative stress, deprives cancer stem cells

from their favored oxidative environment, while it lowers lipid metabolism and tissue stiffness,

presenting opportunities to design LicA-based interventions for breast cancer risk reduction

(Figure 7).

Natural products, if proven efficacious, often offer the required attributes of safety and

tolerability. They have a vast structural diversity and have been the source of more than 60% of

the currently approved drugs for managing various conditions [89, 90]. LicA shows tremendous

potential as a novel risk reducing medication against breast cancer. It is likely to be an orally

effective drug since it complies with Lipinski's rule of 5 (RO5) in drug discovery; it has 2

hydrogen bond donors (RO5 standard < 5), has 6 hydrogen bond acceptors (RO5 standard

<10), exact molecular mass = 338.15180918 g/mol (RO5 standard < 500 g/mol), and a

calculated octanol-water partition coefficient = 4.9 (RO5 standard < 5). It should be noted that

Lipinski's RO5 requires a drug-like compound to comply with at least 3 out of 4 rules to remain

orally active. Based on these physical properties and the biological activities reported herein

and previously, LicA is a good candidate for further studies and development as an alternative

breast cancer risk reduction drug with sufficient efficacy, reduced toxicity, and therefore greater

acceptance by women at increased risk. Such an agent with effects against both ER+ and ER-

subtypes with demonstrated bone protective properties and its potential effects on tissue

stiffness can be predicted to have a better impact and success rate in preventing the majority of

breast cancers.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (IRB STU00202331) was obtained from Northwestern University prior to obtaining informed consents from patients and collecting samples. All experiments were conducted in accordance with the approved protocol and guidelines. All the in vivo studies and procedures were performed under the approved Northwestern University IACUC protocol # IS00013602.

Consent for publication: Not Applicable

Availability of data and materials: The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are available in GEO repository, [PERSISTENT WEB LINK TO DATASETS]

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding: American Cancer Society postdoctoral fellowship 131667-PF-18-049-01NEC to AH, Robert H Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center Translational Bridge Fellowship to AH, National Cancer Institute T32 postdoctoral fellowship to AH, Northwestern University Department of Surgery Seed funding to AH, Bramsen-Hamill Foundation funding to SAK.

Author's contributions: AH developed the hypothesis, designed the study, executed the in vitro, ex vivo, and in vivo studies, analyzed the data, wrote the manuscript. ETB conducted bioinformatics analyses. SC conducted the metabolism flux analyses, RC, analyzed in vivo data and provided biostatistical support. SEC supervised the study design and interpretation of data, edited the manuscript. SAK supervised the study design, clinical relevance, and interpretation of data, edited the manuscript.

Acknowledgements: We thank the Department of Surgery at Northwestern University and the Robert H Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center for their support of this study. We also thank Dr. Oukseub Lee for providing advice and expert assistance during the animal study, Dr. Xiaoling Xuei from the Indiana University Center for Medical Genomics for her advice during the RNA

References

1. Britt KL, Cuzick J, Phillips KA. Key steps for effective breast cancer prevention. Nat Rev Cancer. 2020;20(8):417-36.
2. Trivedi MS, Coe AM, Vanegas A, Kukafka R, Crew KD. Chemoprevention Uptake among Women with Atypical Hyperplasia and Lobular and Ductal Carcinoma In Situ. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2017;10(8):434-41.
3. Hum S, Wu M, Pruthi S, Heisey R. Physician and Patient Barriers to Breast Cancer Preventive Therapy. Curr Breast Cancer Rep. 2016;8(3):158-64.
4. Maresso KC, Tsai KY, Brown PH, Szabo E, Lippman S, Hawk ET. Molecular cancer prevention: Current status and future directions. CA Cancer J Clin. 2015;65(5):345-83.
5. Martinez KA, Fagerlin A, Witteman HO, Holmberg C, Hawley ST. What Matters to Women When Making Decisions About Breast Cancer Chemoprevention? Patient. 2016;9(2):149-59.
6. Jahan N, Jones C, Rahman RL. Endocrine prevention of breast cancer. Mol Cell Endocrinol. 2021;530:111284.
7. Mazumdar A, Tahaney WM, Hill JL, Zhang Y, Ramachandran S, Kawedia J, et al. Targeting the mTOR Pathway for the Prevention of ER-Negative Breast Cancer. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2022;15(12):791-802.
8. Ku AT, Young AIJ, Ibrahim AA, Bu W, Jiang W, Lin M, et al. Short-term PI3K Inhibition Prevents Breast Cancer in Preclinical Models. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2023;16(2):65-73.
9. Chen G, Ding XF, Pressley K, Bouamar H, Wang B, Zheng G, et al. Everolimus Inhibits the Progression of Ductal Carcinoma In Situ to Invasive Breast Cancer Via Downregulation of MMP9 Expression. Clin Cancer Res. 2020;26(6):1486-96.
10. Nye L, Khan SA. Everolimus for Estrogen Receptor-negative Breast Cancer Prevention: A Journey Begun? Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2022;15(12):787-9.
11. Kabat GC, Kim MY, Lee JS, Ho GY, Going SB, Beebe-Dimmer J, et al. Metabolic Obesity Phenotypes and Risk of Breast Cancer in Postmenopausal Women. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2017;26(12):1730-5.
12. Naaman SC, Shen S, Zeytinoglu M, Iyengar NM. Obesity and Breast Cancer Risk: The Oncogenic Implications of Metabolic Dysregulation. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2022;107(8):2154-66.
13. Brantley KD, Zeleznik OA, Dickerman BA, Balasubramanian R, Clish CB, Avila-Pacheco J, et al. A metabolomic analysis of adiposity measures and pre- and postmenopausal breast cancer risk in the Nurses' Health Studies. Br J Cancer. 2022.
14. Cattie R, Henry M, Alberti M, Peeples J, Yuan H, Saxena R, et al. Obesity and breast cancer in women under age 40. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2023;41(16_suppl):10536-.
15. Sheen MA, Cattie R, Chung V, Henry M, Olet S, Alberti M, et al. Obesity and triple negative breast cancer diagnosis among premenopausal women. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2023;41(16_suppl):e22513-e.
16. Cotangco KR, Liao CI, Eakin CM, Chan A, Cohen J, Kapp DS, et al. Trends in Incidence of Cancers Associated With Obesity and Other Modifiable Risk Factors Among Women, 2001-2018. Prev Chronic Dis. 2023;20:E21.
17. Zhao H, Zhou L, Shangguan AJ, Bulun SE. Aromatase expression and regulation in breast and endometrial cancer. J Mol Endocrinol. 2016;57(1):R19-33.
18. Gerard C, Brown KA. Obesity and breast cancer - Role of estrogens and the molecular underpinnings of aromatase regulation in breast adipose tissue. Mol Cell Endocrinol. 2018;466:15-30.
19. Picon-Ruiz M, Morata-Tarifa C, Valle-Goffin JJ, Friedman ER, Slingerland JM. Obesity and adverse breast cancer risk and outcome: Mechanistic insights and strategies for intervention. CA Cancer J Clin. 2017;67(5):378-97.

20.   Holm JB, Rosendahl AH, Borgquist S. Local Biomarkers Involved in the Interplay between Obesity
and Breast Cancer. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(24).
21.   Iyengar NM, Gucalp A, Dannenberg AJ, Hudis CA. Obesity and Cancer Mechanisms: Tumor
Microenvironment and Inflammation. J Clin Oncol. 2016;34(35):4270-6.
22.   Ahmed SM, Luo L, Namani A, Wang XJ, Tang X. Nrf2 signaling pathway: Pivotal roles in
inflammation. Biochim Biophys Acta Mol Basis Dis. 2017;1863(2):585-97.
23.   Cuadrado A, Rojo AI, Wells G, Hayes JD, Cousin SP, Rumsey WL, et al. Therapeutic targeting of
the NRF2 and KEAP1 partnership in chronic diseases. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2019;18(4):295-317.
24.   Iyengar NM, Arthur R, Manson JE, Chlebowski RT, Kroenke CH, Peterson L, et al. Association of
Body Fat and Risk of Breast Cancer in Postmenopausal Women With Normal Body Mass Index: A
Secondary Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial and Observational Study. JAMA Oncol. 2019;5(2):155-
63.
25.   Gupta A, Saraiya V, Deveaux A, Oyekunle T, Jackson KD, Salako O, et al. Association of lipid
profile biomarkers with breast cancer by molecular subtype: analysis of the MEND study. Sci Rep.
2022;12(1):10631.
26.   Dagnell M, Schmidt EE, Arner ESJ. The A to Z of modulated cell patterning by mammalian
thioredoxin reductases. Free Radic Biol Med. 2018;115:484-96.
27.   Peng X, Gimenez-Cassina A, Petrus P, Conrad M, Ryden M, Arner ES. Thioredoxin reductase 1
suppresses adipocyte differentiation and insulin responsiveness. Sci Rep. 2016;6:28080.
28.   Bao J, Zhu L, Zhu Q, Su J, Liu M, Huang W. SREBP-1 is an independent prognostic marker and
promotes invasion and migration in breast cancer. Oncol Lett. 2016;12(4):2409-16.
29.   Bertolio R, Napoletano F, Mano M, Maurer-Stroh S, Fantuz M, Zannini A, et al. Sterol regulatory
element binding protein 1 couples mechanical cues and lipid metabolism. Nat Commun.
2019;10(1):1326.
30.   Wu Y, Li X, Li Q, Cheng C, Zheng L. Adipose tissue-to-breast cancer crosstalk: Comprehensive
insights. Biochim Biophys Acta Rev Cancer. 2022;1877(5):188800.
31.   Bohm MS, Sipe LM, Pye ME, Davis MJ, Pierre JF, Makowski L. The role of obesity and bariatric
surgery-induced weight loss in breast cancer. Cancer Metastasis Rev. 2022;41(3):673-95.
32.   Jaiswal V, Agrawal V, Ang SP, Saleeb M, Ishak A, Hameed M, et al. Post-diagnostic statin use and
its association with cancer recurrence and mortality in breast cancer patients: a systematic review and
meta-analysis. Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Pharmacother. 2023;9(8):731-40.
33.   Hanahan D. Hallmarks of Cancer: New Dimensions. Cancer Discov. 2022;12(1):31-46.
34.   Dietz BM, Hajirahimkhan A, Dunlap TL, Bolton JL. Botanicals and Their Bioactive Phytochemicals
for Women's Health. Pharmacol Rev. 2016;68(4):1026-73.
35.   Hajirahimkhan A, Howell C, Bartom ET, Dong H, Lantvit DD, Xuei X, et al. Breast cancer
prevention with liquiritigenin from licorice through the inhibition of aromatase and protein biosynthesis
in high-risk women's breast tissue. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):8734.
36.   Hajirahimkhan A, Simmler C, Dong H, Lantvit DD, Li G, Chen SN, et al. Induction of
NAD(P)H:Quinone Oxidoreductase 1 (NQO1) by *Glycyrrhiza* Species Used for Women's Health:
Differential Effects of the Michael Acceptors Isoliquiritigenin and Licochalcone A. Chem Res Toxicol.
2015;28(11):2130-41.
37.   Bolton JL, Dunlap TL, Hajirahimkhan A, Mbachu O, Chen SN, Chadwick L, et al. The Multiple
Biological Targets of Hops and Bioactive Compounds. Chem Res Toxicol. 2019;32(2):222-33.
38.   Dunlap TL, Wang S, Simmler C, Chen SN, Pauli GF, Dietz BM, et al. Differential Effects of
Glycyrrhiza Species on Genotoxic Estrogen Metabolism: Licochalcone A Downregulates P450 1B1,
whereas Isoliquiritigenin Stimulates It. Chem Res Toxicol. 2015;28(8):1584-94.

39.   Wang S, Dunlap TL, Huang L, Liu Y, Simmler C, Lantvit DD, et al. Evidence for Chemopreventive
and Resilience Activity of Licorice: Glycyrrhiza Glabra and G. Inflata Extracts Modulate Estrogen
Metabolism in ACI Rats. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2018;11(12):819-30.
40.   Angelova-Fischer I, Rippke F, Richter D, Filbry A, Arrowitz C, Weber T, et al. Stand-alone
Emollient Treatment Reduces Flares After Discontinuation of Topical Steroid Treatment in Atopic
Dermatitis: A Double-blind, Randomized, Vehicle-controlled, Left-right Comparison Study. Acta Derm
Venereol. 2018;98(5):517-23.
41.   Boonchai W, Varothai S, Winayanuwattikun W, Phaitoonvatanakij S, Chaweekulrat P, Kasemsarn
P. Randomized investigator-blinded comparative study of moisturizer containing 4-t-butylcyclohexanol
and licochalcone A versus 0.02% triamcinolone acetonide cream in facial dermatitis. J Cosmet Dermatol.
2018;17(6):1130-5.
42.   Chu X, Ci X, Wei M, Yang X, Cao Q, Guan M, et al. Licochalcone a inhibits lipopolysaccharide-
induced inflammatory response in vitro and in vivo. J Agric Food Chem. 2012;60(15):3947-54.
43.   Guo W, Liu B, Yin Y, Kan X, Gong Q, Li Y, et al. Licochalcone A Protects the Blood-Milk Barrier
Integrity and Relieves the Inflammatory Response in LPS-Induced Mastitis. Front Immunol. 2019;10:287.
44.   Jia T, Qiao J, Guan D, Chen T. Anti-Inflammatory Effects of Licochalcone A on IL-1beta-Stimulated
Human Osteoarthritis Chondrocytes. Inflammation. 2017;40(6):1894-902.
45.   Kolbe L, Immeyer J, Batzer J, Wensorra U, tom Dieck K, Mundt C, et al. Anti-inflammatory
efficacy of Licochalcone A: correlation of clinical potency and in vitro effects. Arch Dermatol Res.
2006;298(1):23-30.
46.   Yan Z, Qi W, Zhan J, Lin Z, Lin J, Xue X, et al. Activating Nrf2 signalling alleviates osteoarthritis
development by inhibiting inflammasome activation. J Cell Mol Med. 2020;24(22):13046-57.
47.   Kim SN, Bae SJ, Kwak HB, Min YK, Jung SH, Kim CH, et al. In vitro and in vivo osteogenic activity
of licochalcone A. Amino Acids. 2012;42(4):1455-65.
48.   Ming L, Jin F, Huang P, Luo H, Liu W, Zhang L, et al. Licochalcone A up-regulates of FasL in
mesenchymal stem cells to strengthen bone formation and increase bone mass. Sci Rep. 2014;4:7209.
49.   Villanueva H, Grimm S, Dhamne S, Rajapakshe K, Visbal A, Davis CM, et al. The Emerging Roles of
Steroid Hormone Receptors in Ductal Carcinoma in Situ (DCIS) of the Breast. J Mammary Gland Biol
Neoplasia. 2018;23(4):237-48.
50.   Lui K, Tamura T, Mori T, Zhou D, Chen S. MCF-7aro/ERE, a novel cell line for rapid screening of
aromatase inhibitors, ERalpha ligands and ERRalpha ligands. Biochem Pharmacol. 2008;76(2):208-15.
51.   Tanos T, Sflomos G, Echeverria PC, Ayyanan A, Gutierrez M, Delaloye JF, et al.
Progesterone/RANKL is a major regulatory axis in the human breast. Sci Transl Med.
2013;5(182):182ra55.
52.   Cartaxo AL, Estrada MF, Domenici G, Roque R, Silva F, Gualda EJ, et al. A novel culture method
that sustains ERalpha signaling in human breast cancer tissue microstructures. J Exp Clin Cancer Res.
2020;39(1):161.
53.   Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-
seq aligner. Bioinformatics. 2013;29(1):15-21.
54.   Yadav S, Virk R, Chung CH, Eduardo MB, VanDerway D, Chen D, et al. Lipid exposure activates
gene expression changes associated with estrogen receptor negative breast cancer. NPJ Breast Cancer.
2022;8(1):59.
55.   Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential
expression analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics. 2010;26(1):139-40.
56.   Chandrasekaran S. A Protocol for the Construction and Curation of Genome-Scale Integrated
Metabolic and Regulatory Network Models. Methods Mol Biol. 2019;1927:203-14.

57.   Shen F, Boccuto L, Pauly R, Srikanth S, Chandrasekaran S. Genome-scale network model of
metabolism and histone acetylation reveals metabolic dependencies of histone deacetylase inhibitors.
Genome Biology. 2019;20(1):49.
58.   Shen F, Cheek C, Chandrasekaran S. Dynamic Network Modeling of Stem Cell Metabolism.
Methods Mol Biol. 2019;1975:305-20.
59.   Chung CH, Lin DW, Eames A, Chandrasekaran S. Next-Generation Genome-Scale Metabolic
Modeling through Integration of Regulatory Mechanisms. Metabolites. 2021;11(9).
60.   Duarte NC, Becker SA, Jamshidi N, Thiele I, Mo ML, Vo TD, et al. Global reconstruction of the
human metabolic network based on genomic and bibliomic data. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2007;104(6):1777-82.
61.   King ZA, Lu J, Drager A, Miller P, Federowicz S, Lerman JA, et al. BiGG Models: A platform for
integrating, standardizing and sharing genome-scale models. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016;44(D1):D515-22.
62.   Snaebjornsson MT, Janaki-Raman S, Schulze A. Greasing the Wheels of the Cancer Machine: The
Role of Lipid Metabolism in Cancer. Cell Metab. 2020;31(1):62-76.
63.   Deng CF, Zhu N, Zhao TJ, Li HF, Gu J, Liao DF, et al. Involvement of LDL and ox-LDL in Cancer
Development and Its Therapeutical Potential. Front Oncol. 2022;12:803473.
64.   Gonzalez-Ortiz A, Galindo-Hernandez O, Hernandez-Acevedo GN, Hurtado-Ureta G, Garcia-
Gonzalez V. Impact of cholesterol-pathways on breast cancer development, a metabolic landscape. J
Cancer. 2021;12(14):4307-21.
65.   Yang J, Stack MS. Lipid Regulatory Proteins as Potential Therapeutic Targets for Ovarian Cancer
in Obese Women. Cancers (Basel). 2020;12(11).
66.   Huang Y, Jin Q, Su M, Ji F, Wang N, Zhong C, et al. Leptin promotes the migration and invasion of
breast cancer cells by upregulating ACAT2. Cell Oncol (Dordr). 2017;40(6):537-47.
67.   Zabielska J, Sledzinski T, Stelmanska E. Acyl-Coenzyme A: Cholesterol Acyltransferase Inhibition
in Cancer Treatment. Anticancer Res. 2019;39(7):3385-94.
68.   Zheng ZG, Zhang X, Zhou YP, Lu C, Thu PM, Qian C, et al. Anhydroicaritin, a SREBPs inhibitor,
inhibits RANKL-induced osteoclastic differentiation and improves diabetic osteoporosis in STZ-induced
mice. Eur J Pharmacol. 2017;809:156-62.
69.   Gautam J, Khedgikar V, Kushwaha P, Choudhary D, Nagar GK, Dev K, et al. Formononetin, an
isoflavone, activates AMP-activated protein kinase/beta-catenin signalling to inhibit adipogenesis and
rescues C57BL/6 mice from high-fat diet-induced obesity and bone loss. Br J Nutr. 2017;117(5):645-61.
70.   Inoue K, Imai Y. Fatostatin, an SREBP inhibitor, prevented RANKL-induced bone loss by
suppression of osteoclast differentiation. Biochim Biophys Acta. 2015;1852(11):2432-41.
71.   Menendez JA, Lupu R. Fatty acid synthase and the lipogenic phenotype in cancer pathogenesis.
Nat Rev Cancer. 2007;7(10):763-77.
72.   Pham DV, Park PH. Adiponectin triggers breast cancer cell death via fatty acid metabolic
reprogramming. J Exp Clin Cancer Res. 2022;41(1):9.
73.   Perone Y, Farrugia AJ, Rodriguez-Meira A, Gyorffy B, Ion C, Uggetti A, et al. SREBP1 drives
Keratin-80-dependent cytoskeletal changes and invasive behavior in endocrine-resistant ERalpha breast
cancer. Nat Commun. 2019;10(1):2115.
74.   Tarchi SM, Pernia Marin M, Hossain MM, Salvatore M. Breast stiffness, a risk factor for cancer
and the role of radiology for diagnosis. J Transl Med. 2023;21(1):582.
75.   Porstmann T, Griffiths B, Chung YL, Delpuech O, Griffiths JR, Downward J, et al. PKB/Akt induces
transcription of enzymes involved in cholesterol and fatty acid biosynthesis via activation of SREBP.
Oncogene. 2005;24(43):6465-81.
76.   Cheng C, Ru P, Geng F, Liu J, Yoo JY, Wu X, et al. Glucose-Mediated N-glycosylation of SCAP Is
Essential for SREBP-1 Activation and Tumor Growth. Cancer Cell. 2015;28(5):569-81.

77.   Yi J, Zhu J, Wu J, Thompson CB, Jiang X. Oncogenic activation of PI3K-AKT-mTOR signaling
suppresses ferroptosis via SREBP-mediated lipogenesis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2020;117(49):31189-
97.
78.   Bakan I, Laplante M. Connecting mTORC1 signaling to SREBP-1 activation. Curr Opin Lipidol.
2012;23(3):226-34.
79.   Zhao Q, Lin X, Wang G. Targeting SREBP-1-Mediated Lipogenesis as Potential Strategies for
Cancer. Front Oncol. 2022;12:952371.
80.   Ascenzi F, De Vitis C, Maugeri-Sacca M, Napoli C, Ciliberto G, Mancini R. SCD1, autophagy and
cancer: implications for therapy. J Exp Clin Cancer Res. 2021;40(1):265.
81.   Tracz-Gaszewska Z, Dobrzyn P. Stearoyl-CoA Desaturase 1 as a Therapeutic Target for the
Treatment of Cancer. Cancers (Basel). 2019;11(7).
82.   Holder AM, Gonzalez-Angulo AM, Chen H, Akcakanat A, Do KA, Fraser Symmans W, et al. High
stearoyl-CoA desaturase 1 expression is associated with shorter survival in breast cancer patients. Breast
Cancer Res Treat. 2013;137(1):319-27.
83.   Xue L, Qi H, Zhang H, Ding L, Huang Q, Zhao D, et al. Targeting SREBP-2-Regulated Mevalonate
Metabolism for Cancer Therapy. Front Oncol. 2020;10:1510.
84.   Bathaie SZ, Ashrafi M, Azizian M, Tamanoi F. Mevalonate Pathway and Human Cancers. Curr Mol
Pharmacol. 2017;10(2):77-85.
85.   Gruenbacher G, Thurnher M. Mevalonate metabolism in cancer. Cancer Lett. 2015;356(2 Pt
A):192-6.
86.   Yu F, Li J, Chen H, Fu J, Ray S, Huang S, et al. Kruppel-like factor 4 (KLF4) is required for
maintenance of breast cancer stem cells and for cell migration and invasion. Oncogene.
2011;30(18):2161-72.
87.   Brown KA, Iyengar NM, Zhou XK, Gucalp A, Subbaramaiah K, Wang H, et al. Menopause Is a
Determinant of Breast Aromatase Expression and Its Associations With BMI, Inflammation, and Systemic
Markers. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2017;102(5):1692-701.
88.   Howe LR. Inflammation and breast cancer. Cyclooxygenase/prostaglandin signaling and breast
cancer. Breast Cancer Res. 2007;9(4):210.
89.   Atanasov AG, Zotchev SB, Dirsch VM, Orhan IE, Banach M, Rollinger JM, et al. Natural products
in drug discovery: advances and opportunities. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery. 2021;20(3):200-16.
90.   Molinari G. Natural Products in Drug Discovery: Present Status and Perspectives. In: Guzmán CA,
Feuerstein GZ, editors. Pharmaceutical Biotechnology. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2009. p. 13-27.

Figure Legends:

Figure 1. Pathway analysis on the RNA sequencing results of postmenopausal high-risk women's breast microstructures treated with LicA. A) downregulates cholesterol and lipid metabolism, **B)** upregulates antioxidant pathways, **C)** downregulates transcription factors associated with inflammation, proliferation, lipid and cholesterol metabolism, and upregulates transcription factors associated with antioxidant response, **D)** shares significant similarities in downregulated and upregulated transcriptomic signatures with statins.

Figure 2. NanoString analysis of additional postmenopausal high-risk women's breast microstructures. LicA downregulates genes associated with lipid and cholesterol metabolism and estrogen carcinogenic metabolism and upregulates antioxidant response genes.

Figure 3. Genome-scale metabolic flux balance analysis in postmenopausal high risk women's breast microstructures. A) Metabolic flux heat map identifies significant flux (p-value < 0.01) through antioxidant pathways, lipid and cholesterol biosynthesis and metabolism. Magnitude of flux difference between treatment and control are shown. **B)** Metabolic flux in the representative pathways is (B. 1) towards the right direction and (B.2) towards the left direction to enhance NAD(P)H generation. **C)** Metabolic flux through pentose phosphate shunt is in the direction generating NAD(P)H without enhancing nucleotide biosynthesis. **D)** Nucleotides essential for bioenergetics and kinetics of the metabolic reactions are salvaged. **E)** Flux through fatty acid elongation drives NAD(P)H generation and formation of saturated fatty acids.

Figure 4. The effect of LicA on proliferation of ER+ and ER- premalignant and malignant breast cell lines. Repeated dosing of LicA exhibits sustained antiproliferative effects in aggressive cells. Red arrows show the time point(s) at which LicA or vehicle control was administered.

Figure 5. Western blot analysis in MCF-7 (ER+) and MDA-MB-231 (ER-) treated with LicA. Quantification of the bands was performed by Image J.

Figure 6. The effect of LicA on the rate of tumor growth in vivo. Subcutaneous administration of LicA (80 mg/kg.day) significantly reduces the rate of tumor growth in xenograft model of **A)** MDA-MB-231 (ER-) tumors and **B)** MCF-7 (ER+) tumors.

Figure 7. The current understanding of LicA's effects on the breast.

Figure 1.

A)

B)

C) TRRUST_Transcription_Factors_2019 gene set

D) drug matrix geneset

Figure 2.

Figure 3. A)

B)

B.1)

acald_c + h2o_c + nadp_c ⇌ ac_c + 2.0 h_c + nadph_c
g6p_c + nadp_c ⇌ 6pgl_c + h_c + nadph_c
6pgc_c + nadp_c ⇌ co2_c + nadph_c + ru5p__D_c
g6p_c + nadp_c ⇌ 6pgl_c + h_c + nadph_c

B.2)

adprib_c + h2o_c ⇌ amp_c + 2.0 h_c + r5p_c
h_r + nadph_r + estrone_r ⇌ nadp_r + estradiol_r
h_r + nadph_r + 1.5 o2_r + andrstrn_r ⇌ 2.0 h2o_r + nadp_r + eandrstrn_r
2.0 h_c + mlthf_c + nadph_c ⇌ 5mthf_c + nadp_c
adn_c + pi_c ⇌ ade_c + r1p_c

C)

D)

Gray font for entities in nucleus

E)

Figure 4.

Figure 5:

Figure 6.

A)

	numDF	F-value	p-value
(Intercept)	1	27.3423752	0.0000005
side	1	1.3155861	0.2529696
trt	1	0.0408081	0.8401462
day	1	43.7456668	0.0000000
trt:day	1	21.3573118	0.0000074

B)

	numDF	F-value	p-value
(Intercept)	1	58.4001020	0.0000000
side	1	6.8985580	0.0096466
trt	1	0.1000614	0.7522556
day	1	6.0161224	0.0154809
trt:day	1	7.8623673	0.0058098

Figure 7.

Graphical Abstract

Green arrows show the effects of LicA in the breast.