<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Ghasimi, S., Haapasalo, H., Eray, M., Korhonen, K., Brännström, T. et al. (2012)
Immunohistochemical analysis of LRIG proteins in meningiomas: correlation between estrogen receptor status and LRIG expression.
Journal of Neuro-Oncology, 108(3): 435-441
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11060-012-0856-x>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-79953>

Immunohistochemical analysis of LRIG proteins in meningiomas: correlation between estrogen receptor status and LRIG expression

Soma Ghasimi¹, Hannu Haapasalo², Mine Eray², Katariina Korhonen³, Thomas Brännström⁴, Håkan Hedman¹, Ulrika Andersson¹

¹Department of Radiation Sciences, Oncology, Umeå University, Sweden. ²Department of Pathology, Center of Laboratory Medicine, Tampere University Hospital, Tampere, Finland.

³Department of Neurosurgery, Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland. ⁴Department of Medical Biosciences, Pathology, Umeå University, Sweden.

Abstract

The leucine-rich repeats and immunoglobulin-like domains (LRIG) protein family is comprised of three integral membrane proteins: LRIG1, LRIG2, and LRIG3. LRIG1 is a negative regulator of growth factor signaling. The expression and subcellular localization of LRIG proteins have prognostic implications in primary brain tumors, such as oligodendrogliomas and astrocytomas. The expression of LRIG proteins has not previously been studied in meningiomas. In this study, the expression of LRIG1, LRIG2, and LRIG3 was analyzed in 409 meningiomas by immunohistochemistry (IHC), and potential associations between LRIG protein expression and tumor grade, gender, progesterone receptor (PR) status, and estrogen receptor (ER) status were investigated. The LRIG proteins were most often expressed in the cytoplasm, though LRIG1 also showed prominent nuclear expression. Cytoplasmic expression of LRIG1 and LRIG2 correlated with histological subtypes of meningiomas ($p = 0.038$ and 0.013 , respectively). Nuclear and cytoplasmic expression of LRIG1 ($p = 0.003$ and 0.004 , respectively) and cytoplasmic expression of LRIG2 ($p = 0.006$) was correlated with ER status. This study is the first to examine the expression of LRIG proteins in meningiomas, and it shows a correlation between ER status and the expression of LRIG1 and LRIG2, which suggests a possible role for LRIG proteins in meningioma pathogenesis.

Introduction

Meningiomas are the most frequently diagnosed primary spinal or cranial tumors. Although meningiomas are usually benign, their intracranial location can lead to severe and lethal consequences [1]. Additionally, a subset of meningiomas is malignant, with a histologically and/or clinically aggressive phenotype. A recent study demonstrated a large variability in mortality rates among meningioma patients [2]. First-degree relatives of patients with meningiomas have an increased risk of developing the disease, but the etiology remains largely unknown [3]. The only established environmental risk factor for meningiomas is ionizing radiation at both low and high doses [4-7]. There is a 2:1 female-to-male incidence ratio. Breast cancer patients have an increased risk of meningiomas [8]. Epidemiological data have suggested that exogenous estrogens and progesterones may promote meningioma development and/or growth, but these associations are controversial [9]. Taken together, these observations indicate an etiological role for female sex hormones in the growth of meningiomas.

The human leucine-rich repeats and immunoglobulin-like domains (LRIG) gene family is comprised of *LRIG1*, *LRIG2*, and *LRIG3* [10-12]. The LRIG genes encode integral membrane proteins consisting of a signal peptide, a leucine-rich repeat domain, three immunoglobulin-like domains, a transmembrane domain, and a cytoplasmic tail. It has been suggested that the subcellular localization of the LRIG proteins may be biologically important [13, 14]. *LRIG1*, located at chromosome 3p14.3 [12], encodes a negative feedback regulator of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) signaling [13] that enhances receptor ubiquitination and degradation rates and inhibits signaling [15-17]. EGFR is commonly expressed in meningiomas [18-20]. *LRIG1* has been suggested to be a tumor suppressor gene, and its expression has been linked with a good prognosis and better patient survival in epithelial

cancers [21-24]. In prostate cancer, LRIG1 protein expression is regulated by androgen [25], whereas in breast cancer, LRIG1 is regulated by estrogen [22]. *LRIG2* and *LRIG3* are located at chromosomes 1p13 [11] and 12q13.2, respectively [10]. Protein expression of LRIG2 and LRIG3 in the perinuclear area of astrocytoma cells has been associated with better patient survival [26], while LRIG2 has also been associated with poor survival when expressed cytoplasmically in oligodendrogliomas and uterine cervical carcinomas [21, 27]. However, the exact functions of LRIG2 and LRIG3 are currently poorly understood and the impact of subcellular LRIG protein localization on EGFR expression is not known. In meningiomas, the expression profiles of LRIG proteins have not been described. In this study, we used immunohistochemistry (IHC) to evaluate potential associations between LRIG protein expression in meningiomas and histological subtypes, gender, progesterone receptor (PR) status, and estrogen receptor (ER) status.

Materials and methods

Study population and tumor specimens

The original material consists of all patients who underwent surgery for intracranial meningioma at the Tampere University Hospital during 1989-1999. First, two patients were excluded from the studies because of their young age (4 and 15 years). Then, all the tumors with enough tumor material for the tissue micro-array blocks were included in the studies. This material of 510 tumors is presented previously in the paper by Korhonen et al [28]. The present study is based on the same material. However, some of the immunostainings failed or tissue core samples were lost during the section preparation and immunostaining steps. Unfortunately, these cases included all the WHO grade III meningiomas presented in the study by Korhonen et al. All the remaining 409 meningiomas were included in this study.

There were too few WHO grade III meningiomas in this study and therefore they were excluded. A total of 399 primary and 10 recurrent tumor specimens were included. The study protocol was approved by the Ethical Committee of Tampere University Hospital. The tumors were classified and graded using the World Health Organization (WHO) scheme (grades I-II) [29]. Patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Immunohistochemistry

Tissue microarrays (TMA) were used for the IHC analysis [30]. The tumor samples were fixed in a phosphate-buffered 4% formaldehyde solution and processed into paraffin blocks using standard methods. Histologically representative tumor regions of hematoxylin and eosin-stained slides were selected by a neuropathologist (HHa), and corresponding areas were sampled in tissue microarray blocks using a custom built instrument (Beecher Instruments, Silver Spring, MD). One tissue core with a diameter of 600 μm from each tumor was included in the TMA. Polyclonal rabbit antibodies against the cytoplasmic tails of the respective LRIG protein were used for the immunohistochemical labeling of LRIG proteins as previously described [11, 26, 31]. IHC was performed using the Ventana Benchmark system (Ventana Medical System Inc., Tucson, Arizona). As a pre-treatment step, tissues were subjected to heat-induced epitope retrieval with the Cell Conditioning 2 solution (Ventana) for 32 min. The stained TMAs were evaluated by three observers, including one experienced neuropathologist (HHa) and one experienced pathologist (ME), and a consensus for each case was determined. Cytoplasmic immunoreactivity was scored in four different categories: 0 for no or very faint immunoreactivity, 1 for weak immunoreactivity, 2 for moderate immunoreactivity, and 3 for intense immunoreactivity. The nuclear and perinuclear immunoreactivities were scored as 0 (negative) for sections with less than 10% immunopositive cells or 1 (positive) for sections with 10% or more immunopositive cells. For

immunohistochemistry of hormone receptors, monoclonal antibodies 6F11, PGR312, and 2F12 were used for PR, ER, and AR, respectively (Novocastra Laboratories, Newcastle, UK). Antigen retrieval was carried out described above. All antibodies were diluted at 1 µg/ml, and detected with a peroxidase-polymer based detection kit (PoerVision+, Immunovision Technologies, Daly City, CA) according to manufacturers instructions.

Statistical analysis

Associations between gender, tumor grade, ER status, and PR status and expression of LRIG1, LRIG2, and LRIG3 were evaluated using the chi-squared test. The subcellular distribution of LRIG1, LRIG2, and LRIG3 was evaluated using the Kruskal-Wallis test, and the results are shown as bar graphs. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

Immunohistochemical analysis of LRIG protein expression in meningiomas

LRIG protein expression was analyzed by IHC in 409 meningioma tumor samples collected in a TMA (Table 1). LRIG protein expression was observed in the nuclei, cytoplasm, and perinuclear areas of meningioma cells (Figure 1 and 2) with occasional immunoreactivity observed in several compartments within individual cells. For example, tumors that displayed perinuclear immunoreactivity also often showed cytoplasmic immunoreactivity. For LRIG1, 67% of the tumors showed cytoplasmic immunoreactivity, 10% showed perinuclear immunoreactivity, and 45% showed nuclear immunoreactivity. LRIG2 showed mostly

cytoplasmic immunoreactivity and only rarely perinuclear and nuclear immunoreactivity.

LRIG3 immunoreactivity was only observed in the cytoplasm.

LRIG1 and LRIG2 cytoplasmic expression showed a significant correlation with histological subtypes of meningiomas, with expression most frequently observed in the benign subtypes (fibrous and transitional) (Table 2; $p = 0.038$ and 0.013 , respectively). No significant correlation was observed between LRIG3 expression and histological subtypes. A correlation between tumor grade and LRIG3 expression was of borderline significance (data not shown, $p = 0.050$). There was no significant correlation observed between LRIG expression and gender (data not shown).

There was a significant correlation detected between ER status and cytoplasmic and nuclear LRIG1 expression (Table 3; $p = 0.003$ and 0.004 , respectively). ER status also correlated with cytoplasmic LRIG2 expression ($p = 0.006$). No relationship between ER status and LRIG3 expression was observed (Table 3).

In this study we had ten recurrent meningiomas and the statistical analysis did not reveal any association between the LRIG proteins and recurrence (data not shown).

Discussion

The current study provides the first characterization of the expression and distribution of LRIG proteins in human meningiomas. This tumor type is twice as common in women as it is in men. Female sex hormones (i.e., estrogens) may play a role in the pathogenesis of meningiomas, and estrogen treatment has been proposed as a risk factor. In a large European cohort study, the impact of exogenous hormone use in association with glioma and meningioma risk was analyzed. The study showed an increased meningioma risk for current

users of hormones [32]. A population-based case-control study recently conducted in a Finnish population indicated that reproductive factors or the use of exogenous sex hormones affected meningioma risk [33]. Normal meningeal tissues do not express ER [34], and the level of ER expression in meningiomas differs between various studies. In a recent paper, approximately one third of meningiomas were reported to express ER [35]. Some studies have shown that overexpression of ER is associated with more aggressive clinical behavior of meningiomas [36]. The current study revealed a correlation between ER status and the expression of LRIG1 and LRIG2 proteins in meningiomas. LRIG1 was recently shown to be an estrogen-regulated growth suppressor in breast cancer [22]. Our results suggest that LRIG1 is regulated by the estrogen receptor also in meningiomas. Less is known about the regulation of LRIG2 expression. However, LRIG2 is highly expressed in the female reproductive organs, including the uterus and ovaries [11], which also indicates a gender-specific regulation. Whether LRIG1 and LRIG2 function as growth suppressors in meningiomas remains to be determined. LRIG1 negatively regulates the growth stimulatory EGFR family members, and EGFR and ERBB2 are prominently overexpressed in certain meningiomas. Thus it seems likely that LRIG1 may also function as a growth suppressor in meningiomas. However, expression of LRIG1 and LRIG2 was not associated with tumor grade, suggesting that the LRIG proteins do not have a clear role in malignant progression from grade I to grade II meningiomas. In summary, this study is the first to characterize the expression and subcellular distribution of LRIG proteins in meningiomas. ER status correlated with the expression of LRIG1 and LRIG2, which suggests a potential role for LRIG proteins in the pathogenesis of meningiomas but more studies are needed to confirm this hypothesis.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Wiemels, J., M. Wrensch, and E.B. Claus, *Epidemiology and etiology of meningioma*. J Neurooncol. **99**(3): p. 307-14.
2. Patil, C.G., et al., *Craniotomy for resection of meningioma in the elderly: a multicentre, prospective analysis from the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program*. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. **81**(5): p. 502-5.
3. Malmer, B., R. Henriksson, and H. Gronberg, *Familial brain tumours-genetics or environment? A nationwide cohort study of cancer risk in spouses and first-degree relatives of brain tumour patients*. Int J Cancer, 2003. **106**(2): p. 260-3.
4. Preston, D.L., et al., *Tumors of the nervous system and pituitary gland associated with atomic bomb radiation exposure*. J Natl Cancer Inst, 2002. **94**(20): p. 1555-63.
5. Umansky, F., et al., *Radiation-induced meningioma*. Neurosurg Focus, 2008. **24**(5): p. E7.
6. Sadetzki, S., et al., *Genotyping of patients with sporadic and radiation-associated meningiomas*. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev, 2005. **14**(4): p. 969-76.
7. Sadetzki, S., et al., *Radiation-induced meningioma: a descriptive study of 253 cases*. J Neurosurg, 2002. **97**(5): p. 1078-82.
8. Schoenberg, B.S., B.W. Christine, and J.P. Whisnant, *Nervous system neoplasms and primary malignancies of other sites. The unique association between meningiomas and breast cancer*. Neurology, 1975. **25**(8): p. 705-12.
9. Custer, B., et al., *Hormonal exposures and the risk of intracranial meningioma in women: a population-based case-control study*. BMC Cancer, 2006. **6**: p. 152.
10. Guo, D., et al., *The LRIG gene family has three vertebrate paralogs widely expressed in human and mouse tissues and a homolog in Ascidacea*. Genomics, 2004. **84**(1): p. 157-65.
11. Holmlund, C., et al., *Characterization and tissue-specific expression of human LRIG2*. Gene, 2004. **332**: p. 35-43.
12. Nilsson, J., et al., *Cloning, characterization, and expression of human LIG1*. Biochem Biophys Res Commun, 2001. **284**(5): p. 1155-61.
13. Hedman, H. and R. Henriksson, *LRIG inhibitors of growth factor signalling - double-edged swords in human cancer?* Eur J Cancer, 2007. **43**(4): p. 676-82.
14. Karlsson, T., et al., *Redistribution of LRIG proteins in psoriasis*. J Invest Dermatol, 2008. **128**(5): p. 1192-5.

15. Gur, G., et al., *LRIG1 restricts growth factor signaling by enhancing receptor ubiquitylation and degradation*. EMBO J, 2004. **23**(16): p. 3270-81.
16. Laederich, M.B., et al., *The leucine-rich repeat protein LRIG1 is a negative regulator of ErbB family receptor tyrosine kinases*. J Biol Chem, 2004. **279**(45): p. 47050-6.
17. Yi, W., et al., *Paracrine regulation of growth factor signaling by shed leucine-rich repeats and immunoglobulin-like domains I*. Exp Cell Res. **317**(4): p. 504-12.
18. Torp, S.H., et al., *Expression of epidermal growth factor receptor in human meningiomas and meningeal tissue*. APMIS, 1992. **100**(9): p. 797-802.
19. Andersson, U., et al., *Epidermal growth factor receptor family (EGFR, ErbB2-4) in gliomas and meningiomas*. Acta Neuropathol, 2004. **108**(2): p. 135-42.
20. Wernicke, A.G., et al., *Assessment of Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor (EGFR) expression in human meningioma*. Radiat Oncol. **5**: p. 46.
21. Hedman, H., et al., *LRIG2 in contrast to LRIG1 predicts poor survival in early-stage squamous cell carcinoma of the uterine cervix*. Acta Oncol. **49**(6): p. 812-5.
22. Krig, S.R., et al., *Lrig1 Is an Estrogen-Regulated Growth Suppressor and Correlates with Longer Relapse-Free Survival in ER{alpha}-Positive Breast Cancer*. Mol Cancer Res.
23. Tanemura, A., et al., *LRIG-1 provides a novel prognostic predictor in squamous cell carcinoma of the skin: immunohistochemical analysis for 38 cases*. Dermatol Surg, 2005. **31**(4): p. 423-30.
24. Lindstrom, A.K., et al., *LRIG1 and squamous epithelial uterine cervical cancer: correlation to prognosis, other tumor markers, sex steroid hormones, and smoking*. Int J Gynecol Cancer, 2008. **18**(2): p. 312-7.
25. Thomasson, M., et al., *LRIG1 and the liar paradox in prostate cancer: a study of the expression and clinical significance of LRIG1 in prostate cancer*. Int J Cancer. **128**(12): p. 2843-52.
26. Guo, D., et al., *Perinuclear leucine-rich repeats and immunoglobulin-like domain proteins (LRIG1-3) as prognostic indicators in astrocytic tumors*. Acta Neuropathol, 2006. **111**(3): p. 238-46.
27. Holmlund, C., et al., *Cytoplasmic LRIG2 expression is associated with poor oligodendroglioma patient survival*. Neuropathology, 2009. **29**(3): p. 242-7.
28. Korhonen, K., et al., *Female predominance in meningiomas can not be explained by differences in progesterone, estrogen, or androgen receptor expression*. J Neurooncol, 2006. **80**(1): p. 1-7.
29. David N. Louis, H.O., Otmar D. Weistler, Webster K. Cavenee, ed. *WHO classification of Tumours of the Central Nervous System*. 2007.

30. Kononen, J., et al., *Tissue microarrays for high-throughput molecular profiling of tumor specimens*. Nat Med, 1998. **4**(7): p. 844-7.
31. Nilsson, J., et al., *LRIG1 protein in human cells and tissues*. Cell Tissue Res, 2003. **312**(1): p. 65-71.
32. Michaud, D.S., et al., *Reproductive factors and exogenous hormone use in relation to risk of glioma and meningioma in a large European cohort study*. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. **19**(10): p. 2562-9.
33. Korhonen, K., et al., *Exogenous sex hormone use and risk of meningioma: a population-based case-control study in Finland*. Cancer Causes Control. **21**(12): p. 2149-56.
34. Leaes, C.G., et al., *Immunohistochemical expression of aromatase and estrogen, androgen and progesterone receptors in normal and neoplastic human meningeal cells*. Neuropathology, 2010. **30**(1): p. 44-9.
35. Guevara, P., et al., *Angiogenesis and expression of estrogen and progesterone receptors as predictive factors for recurrence of meningioma*. J Neurooncol. **98**(3): p. 379-84.
36. Pravdenkova, S., et al., *Progesterone and estrogen receptors: opposing prognostic indicators in meningiomas*. J Neurosurg, 2006. **105**(2): p. 163-73.

Table 1 Characterization of the meningioma patients included in the tissue microarray (TMA) analyses.

Total number of patients	409
Gender (female/male)	324/85
Age at diagnosis median (yrs)	59 (4-84)
Female	60
Male	57
Histological subtypes (WHO 2007)	
Meningothelial	138
Fibrous (Fibroblastic)	83
Transitional (mixed)	129
Other benign	28
Atypical	31
Tumor grade (WHO 2007)	
Grade I	378
Grade II	31

Table 2 The localization of LRIG protein expression in meningiomas in relation to histological subtypes.

Histological subtypes			Meningothelial n (%)	Fibroblastic n (%)	Transitional n (%)	Other benign n (%)	Atypical n (%)	Chi-square tests (<i>P</i>)
LRIG1	Nuclear	Negative	76 (58.9)	36 (49.3)	72 (58.1)	17 (58.6)	10 (38.5)	0.264
		Positive	53 (41.1)	37 (50.7)	52 (41.9)	12 (41.4)	16 (61.5)	
	Perinuclear	Negative	116 (89.9)	69 (93.2)	111 (89.5)	24 (82.8)	24 (92.3)	0.600
		Positive	13 (10.1)	5 (6.8)	13 (10.5)	5 (17.2)	2 (7.7)	
	Cytoplasmic	Negative	35 (24.1)	34 (45.9)	39 (31.5)	11 (37.9)	9 (34.6)	0.038
		Faint	42 (32.6)	28 (37.8)	47 (37.9)	7 (24.1)	12 (46.2)	
		Moderate	36 (27.9)	10 (13.5)	31 (25.0)	8 (27.6)	5 (19.2)	
		Strong	16 (12.4)	2 (2.7)	7 (5.6)	3 (10.3)	0 (0)	
LRIG2	Nuclear	Negative	130 (100)	75 (98.7)	126 (100)	29 (100)	27 (100)	0.391
		Positive	0 (0)	1 (1.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
	Perinuclear	Negative	129 (98.5)	73 (96.1)	123 (97.6)	29 (100)	25 (92.6)	0.348
		Positive	2 (1.5)	3 (3.9)	3 (2.4)	0 (0)	2 (7.4)	
	Cytoplasmic	Negative	22 (16.8)	19 (25.0)	22 (17.3)	10 (34.5)	1 (3.7)	0.013
		Faint	77 (58.8)	51 (67.1)	74 (58.3)	16 (55.2)	16 (59.3)	
		Moderate	27 (20.6)	4 (5.3)	29 (22.8)	2 (6.9)	9 (33.3)	
		Strong	5 (3.8)	2 (2.6)	2 (1.6)	1 (3.4)	1 (3.7)	
LRIG3	Nuclear	Negative	130 (100)	80 (100)	126 (100)	29 (100)	26 (100)	N/A
		Positive	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
	Perinuclear	Negative	130 (100)	80 (100)	127 (100)	29 (100)	26 (100)	N/A
		Positive	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
	Cytoplasmic	Negative	21 (16.2)	22 (27.2)	21 (16.5)	7 (24.1)	3 (11.5)	0.185
		Faint	95 (73.1)	56 (69.1)	96 (75.6)	21 (72.4)	19 (73.1)	
		Moderate	13 (10.0)	3 (3.7)	10 (7.9)	1 (3.4)	3 (11.5)	
		Strong	1 (0.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (3.8)	

Cytoplasmic staining was scored as negative (0) or positive (1, 2, or 3). Nuclear and perinuclear staining was scored as negative (0) or positive (1). NA, Not applicable. Significant associations ($p < 0.05$) are in bold. Total tumor numbers may vary due to success rates of staining in the TMA analyses.

Table 3 Association between LRIG protein expression and estrogen receptor status.

			Estrogen status	Negative n (%)	Positive n (%)	Chi-square tests (<i>P</i>)
LRIG1	Nuclear	Negative		102 (48.1)	88 (63.3)	0.005
		Positive		110 (51.9)	51 (36.7)	
	Perinuclear	Negative		193 (90.6)	122 (87.8)	0.396
		Positive		20 (9.4)	17 (12.2)	
	Cytoplasmic	Negative		75 (35.2)	35 (25.2)	0.021
		Faint		82 (38.5)	46 (33.1)	
		Moderate		42 (19.7)	45 (32.4)	
		Strong		14 (6.6)	13 (9.4)	
LRIG2	Nuclear	Negative		218 (100)	141 (100)	N/A
		Positive		0 (0)	0 (0)	
	Perinuclear	Negative		215 (98.6)	137 (96.5)	0.177
		Positive		3 (1.4)	5 (3.5)	
	Cytoplasmic	Negative		38 (17.4)	25 (17.6)	0.028
		Faint		141 (64.4)	78 (54.9)	
		Moderate		38 (17.4)	31 (21.8)	
		Strong		2 (0.9)	8 (5.6)	
LRIG3	Nuclear	Negative		220 (100)	142 (100)	N/A
		Positive		0 (0)	0 (0)	
	Perinuclear	Negative		221 (100)	142 (100)	N/A
		Positive		0 (0)	0 (0)	
	Cytoplasmic	Negative		37 (16.7)	28 (19.7)	0.433
		Faint		167 (75.2)	100 (70.4)	
		Moderate		16 (7.2)	14 (9.9)	
		Strong		2 (0.9)	0 (0)	

Cytoplasmic staining was scored as negative (0) or positive (1, 2, or 3). Nuclear and perinuclear staining was scored as negative (0) or positive (1). Estrogen status was scored as positive (1) or negative (2). Significant associations ($p < 0.05$) are in bold. Total tumor numbers may vary due to success rates of staining in the TMA analyses.

Figure legends

Fig. 1: Immunostaining of LRIG proteins in meningiomas. (a) Fibroblastic meningioma that is negative for LRIG1 staining (original magnification, x400). (b) Fibroblastic meningioma with strong nuclear LRIG1 staining (original magnification, x400). (c) Meningoethelial meningioma with perinuclear (long arrow) and strong cytoplasmic (short arrow) LRIG1 staining (original magnification, x600). (d) Meningoethelial meningioma with predominantly cytoplasmic LRIG1 staining (original magnification, x200). (e) Fibroblastic meningioma that is negative for LRIG2 staining (original magnification, x200). (f) Meningoethelial meningioma with cytoplasmic LRIG2 staining (original magnification, x400). (g) Meningoethelial meningioma that is negative for LRIG3 staining (original magnification, x200). (h) Meningoethelial meningioma with cytoplasmic LRIG3 staining (original magnification, x400).

Fig. 2

Fig. 2: The subcellular localization of LRIG protein immunoreactivity for the 409 meningioma tumors depicted in bar graphs. (a) For cytoplasmic staining, no immunoreactivity was scored as 0, weak as 1, moderate as 2, and strong immunoreactivity as 3. (b) For perinuclear and (c) nuclear staining, no immunoreactivity was scored as 0, and positive immunoreactivity was scored as 1.