International Journal of Web of Multidisciplinary Studies
(Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal)
website: https://ijwos.com OPEN ACCESS E-ISSN : 3049-2424
Volume 3 Issue 3 , March 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.71366/ijwos03032676628

Role of the Tumor Microenvironment in Modulating Drug Response in ER-Positive Breast Cancer (Study from Co-Culture Systems)

Gangoutri Das[1]
[1] *Research Scholar, Assam University, Silchar.*

Article Info

Article History:

Published:23 March 2026

Publication Issue:
Volume 3, Issue 3
March-2026

Page Number:
468-488

Corresponding Author:
Gangoutri Das

Abstract:

Estrogen receptor–positive breast cancer represents the most prevalent molecular subtype of breast malignancy and remains a major clinical challenge due to the frequent development of resistance to endocrine and chemotherapeutic agents. Increasing evidence suggests that this resistance is not solely driven by intrinsic tumor cell alterations but is strongly influenced by the surrounding tumor microenvironment. In particular, cancer-associated fibroblasts play a pivotal role in regulating tumor progression, survival signalling, and therapeutic response through complex paracrine interactions, extracellular matrix remodelling, and metabolic support. This study explores the impact of heterogeneous co-culture systems comprising ER^+ breast cancer cells and fibroblasts to better understand stromal-mediated drug resistance mechanisms. By analysing existing co-culture-based experimental datasets, the study compares drug sensitivity in conventional monoculture models with three-dimensional fibroblast–tumor co-culture models. The findings demonstrate that fibroblast-rich microenvironments significantly reduce the efficacy of endocrine therapies such as tamoxifen and fulvestrant, as well as cytotoxic drugs, by activating alternative growth factor signalling pathways, enhancing extracellular matrix deposition, and promoting pro-survival metabolic reprogramming. Overall, the study highlights the limitations of traditional monoculture drug screening platforms and emphasises the importance of tumor microenvironment-inclusive models for accurate prediction of clinical drug responses. Understanding stromal–epithelial crosstalk provides a rational foundation for developing combination therapies that simultaneously target tumor cells and their supportive microenvironment, thereby offering improved strategies for overcoming endocrine resistance in ER^+ breast cancer.

Keywords: ER-positive breast cancer, Tumor microenvironment, Cancer-associated fibroblasts, Drug resistance, Co-culture model, Endocrine therapy

1. ER-Positive Breast Cancer and Therapeutic Challenges

Estrogen receptor–positive (ER+) breast cancer accounts for nearly 70% of all breast cancer cases; however, 20–40% of patients relapse or develop metastasis despite receiving adjuvant endocrine therapy. Recurrence is associated with a markedly poorer prognosis, with mortality reaching nearly 65% within ten years after locoregional relapse and approximately 80% within four years following distant metastasis. Primary (de novo) endocrine resistance—defined as disease progression within six months of first-line therapy—affects 15–20% of patients, reflecting intrinsic biological non-responsiveness rather than acquired adaptation. This remains a major

clinical challenge despite advances in endocrine treatments such as SERMs, aromatase inhibitors, SERDs, and CDK4/6 inhibitors.

Current molecular evidence indicates that endocrine resistance arises from complex, multi-level biological mechanisms extending beyond estrogen receptor dysfunction alone. In addition to ESR1 mutations and ERα loss, activation of growth factor signaling—particularly fibroblast growth factor receptor (FGFR) pathways—drives resistance in nearly 40% of metastatic ER+ breast cancers and is associated with poor survival outcomes. Notably, resistant patients present at a significantly younger age than therapy responders, highlighting the critical role of systemic biology and the tumor microenvironment in shaping therapeutic response.

Tumor Microenvironment as a Biological Regulator

The tumor microenvironment (TME) acts as an immunologically dynamic system that continuously influences tumor behavior and response to therapy. Cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs), as the major stromal population, play a central role in promoting drug resistance and immune escape through extensive paracrine communication. (Paracrine Signalling in CAF Review, 2025).

Bidirectional communication between cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs) and tumor cells critically regulates endocrine therapy response. Tumor cells reprogram fibroblasts via TGF-β signaling, activating the non-canonical TGF-β/RhoA/ROCK pathway and driving extracellular matrix (ECM) remodeling (Paracrine Signaling in CAF Review, 2025). In co-culture models, fibroblasts enhance estradiol production, strengthening estrogen signaling in hormone-sensitive cancer cells and promoting survival under therapeutic stress (PLOS ONE, 2015).

CAFs also secrete immunosuppressive mediators, including CXCL12, TGF-β, and IL-6, which recruit suppressive immune cells and impair cytotoxic T-cell activity, thereby establishing an immune-excluded tumor microenvironment (TME) (Paracrine Signaling in CAF Review, 2025).

ECM remodeling further contributes to therapeutic resistance. Elevated α-SMA expression and increased collagen and fibronectin deposition in co-culture spheroids indicate fibroblast differentiation into myofibroblast-like CAFs, forming a dense physical barrier that restricts drug penetration and immune infiltration (Scientific Reports, 2020). Collectively, paracrine signaling and ECM remodelling cooperate to promote epithelial–mesenchymal transition, immune evasion, and endocrine drug resistance through coordinated CXCL12–TGF-β regulation (Paracrine Signalling in CAF Review, 2025).

Monoculture Models: Fundamental Limitations

Conventional in vitro cancer research primarily uses two-dimensional monolayer cultures on plastic surfaces, which eliminate essential cellular and acellular components of the tumor microenvironment required for accurate

drug response prediction. Comparative gene expression analysis of breast cancer monocultures and fibroblast co-cultures demonstrates markedly different transcriptional profiles that closely resemble in vivo stromal–epithelial interactions, highlighting the limitations of monoculture systems (PLOS ONE, 2015). Furthermore, therapeutic strategies targeting the tumor microenvironment in co-culture models yield superior outcomes, indicating that monoculture-based drug screening frequently overestimates treatment efficacy and contributes to clinical failure in microenvironment-rich tumors (Optimal Breast Cancer 3D Spheroid Study, 2019).

Co-Culture Systems: Advantages and Rationale

Three-dimensional (3D) co-culture spheroid models integrating fibroblasts with cancer cells provide a more physiologically relevant system than conventional 2D monolayers. Unlike 2D or trans-well systems lacking direct cell–cell contact, 3D co-cultures induce distinct patterns of cancer cell proliferation and survival, demonstrating that different tumor types stimulate unique fibroblast-derived secretory responses (PLOS ONE, 2015). Advanced 3D spheroids composed of luminal breast cancer cells and fibroblasts enable detailed investigation of tumor microenvironment homeostasis, where fibroblasts differentiate into myofibroblasts and exhibit robust extracellular matrix (ECM) expression (Scientific Reports, 2020).

Study Rationale and Aims

Given the high prevalence of ER+ breast cancer and its 30–50% endocrine resistance rate, along with the superior predictive value of co-culture models and the limited mechanistic scope of clinical trials, secondary analysis of existing co-culture datasets is well justified. Such analysis enables cost-effective use of validated data on drug response, molecular signaling, and stromal interactions (Secondary Analysis Research, 2019). This study aims to examine fibroblast-mediated modulation of therapy response, identify resistance-driving paracrine and ECM mechanisms, evaluate clinical predictability of co-culture drug profiles, and uncover stromal targets to overcome microenvironment-induced resistance.

We hypothesize that stromal fibroblasts substantially attenuate therapeutic efficacy through paracrine factor secretion (HGF, FGF, TGF-β), ECM remodeling, and metabolic interactions, with magnitude of stromal-mediated resistance exhibiting inter-sample heterogeneity reflecting patient-to-patient variations in CAF phenotype and ECM composition. By systematically characterizing stromal-epithelial crosstalk through secondary co-culture analysis, this investigation bridges the gap between monoculture tractability and in vivo biological complexity, providing rational foundations for therapeutic development targeting tumor epithelium and malignant stroma in endocrine-resistant ER+ breast cancer.

2. Materials and Methods

Study Design and Analytical Framework

This investigation constitutes a secondary data-based exploratory and comparative analysis of existing co-culture experimental datasets examining drug response in estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. The analytical framework integrates quantitative drug sensitivity measurements obtained from monoculture and co-culture conditions, enabling systematic comparison of therapeutic efficacy across experimental paradigms. Secondary data analysis permits rapid hypothesis generation and mechanistic interrogation without requiring primary data collection, whilst leveraging previously established co-culture protocols with comprehensive molecular and phenotypic characterization (Yakavets et al., 2020). The study design prioritizes comparative analysis between epithelial monolayer cultures and epithelial–stromal co-culture systems to identify paracrine signaling-dependent modulation of drug response, stratified by cancer cell lineage and therapeutic agent category (endocrine agents versus cytotoxic compounds). Graphical and tabular data from experimental studies were integrated to construct a cohesive narrative regarding stromal-mediated modulation of ER-positive breast cancer cell drug sensitivity.

Data Sources and Dataset Description

Primary data sources comprised peer-reviewed published studies examining co-culture of ER-positive breast cancer cell lines with stromal fibroblasts using three-dimensional and two-dimensional culture paradigms. Tabular legends and experimental figures provided quantitative measurements of cell viability, proliferation markers, drug-induced cytotoxicity, and gene expression signatures. Co-culture experimental data encompassed direct cell-cell contact models utilizing collagen or Matrigel-based three-dimensional matrices, as well as indirect transwell-based co-culture configurations permitting paracrine factor exchange without cellular contact. Datasets included measurements of drug responses to estrogen-targeting therapies (tamoxifen, fulvestrant, aromatase inhibitors), CDK4/6 inhibitors (palbociclib, ribociclib), and chemotherapeutic agents (doxorubicin, paclitaxel). Fibroblast populations encompassed both primary human mammary fibroblasts and immortalized fibroblast cell lines (MRC-5), with some datasets incorporating tumor-associated fibroblasts (TAFs) isolated from primary ER-positive breast cancer specimens. Cell viability measurements employed standard assays including MTT (3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide) colorimetric assays, live/dead staining with fluorescent markers, and luminescence-based ATP quantification (PLOS ONE, 2015; Yakavets et al., 2020).

Co-Culture Model Overview

Cell Line Selection and Culture Conditions

ER-positive breast cancer cell lines employed in source datasets included MCF-7, T47D, and BT-474, each representing established Luminal A or Luminal B molecular subtypes with documented estrogen receptor dependence and variable endocrine therapy sensitivity profiles. These cell lines were maintained in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium (DMEM) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) under standard 5% CO_2 humidified incubation at 37°C. Stromal fibroblast populations comprised MRC-5 (human fetal fibroblasts) and

primary human mammary fibroblasts, routinely cultured in identical medium conditions. Some experimental protocols incorporated tumor-associated fibroblasts (TAFs) derived from primary ER-positive breast cancer surgical specimens (Science Advances, 2023).

Three-Dimensional Co-Culture Architecture

Advanced co-culture spheroid models employed sequential seeding of fibroblasts into pre-formed cancer cell aggregates with a 24-hour delay to establish homogenous fibroblast distribution reflecting clinical tumor microenvironment architecture more precisely (Yakavets et al., 2020). Optimal cellular ratios of 1 ER-positive cancer cell to 1.5 fibroblasts were employed to maximize fibroblast-mediated effects whilst ensuring cancer cell-predominant proliferation within spheroids. Co-cultures were generated in ultra-low adherence polystyrene plates (96-well or 384-well formats) to facilitate spontaneous three-dimensional spheroid formation. Spheroids were maintained in serum-free medium to eliminate exogenous growth factor stimulation and accentuate paracrine signaling-dependent cancer cell responses. Culture duration extended 5–7 days to permit fibroblast differentiation into myofibroblast-like phenotypes, establishment of extracellular matrix networks, and stabilization of paracrine signaling crosstalk (Yakavets et al., 2020; PMC Coculture Protocols, 2024).

Drug Exposure Conditions

Pharmacological interventions encompassed endocrine-targeted agents administered at physiologically relevant concentrations—tamoxifen (0.5–2 μM), fulvestrant (1–10 nM), aromatase inhibitors (letrozole/anastrozole 10–100 nM)—mimicking systemic exposure achieved in treated patients. CDK4/6 inhibitors were applied at concentrations producing partial cell cycle arrest (palbociclib 100–500 nM), permitting identification of stromal-mediated bypass mechanisms. Cytotoxic chemotherapeutic agents (doxorubicin 50–500 nM, paclitaxel 1–50 nM) were employed at concentrations spanning sublethal to highly cytotoxic thresholds. Monoculture ER-positive cancer cells received identical drug exposures as co-cultured counterparts to enable direct efficacy comparison. Treatment duration extended 72–120 hours to permit manifestation of both acute drug responses and adaptive resistance mechanisms.

Outcome Measures

Primary outcome measures encompassed quantitative assessment of cancer cell viability in monoculture versus co-culture conditions following drug exposure, expressed as percentage of viable cells relative to vehicle-treated controls. Drug sensitivity indicators included IC_{50} values (drug concentration producing 50% viability reduction) and area-under-curve (AUC) calculations quantifying dose-response relationships. Secondary endpoints encompassed cell proliferation rates assessed via EdU (5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine) incorporation or Ki-67 immunofluorescence quantification, apoptosis measurement through annexin V staining or caspase-3 activation,

and colony-forming capacity via clonogenic survival assays. Phenotypic response markers included morphological assessment of spheroid integrity and fibroblast infiltration patterns, expression of fibroblast activation markers (α-smooth muscle actin/α-SMA), and quantification of extracellular matrix deposition (collagen, fibronectin) via immunofluorescence microscopy.

Data Interpretation and Analysis Strategy

Comparative analysis examined drug response differential between monoculture and co-culture conditions, quantifying the magnitude of stromal-mediated resistance via calculation of fold-change in IC_{50} values and differential viability retention between experimental paradigms. Trend-based analysis identified patterns of fibroblast-mediated protection across drug categories, with particular attention to endocrine-targeting agents versus chemotherapeutics. Visual interpretation of graphical datasets encompassed assessment of dose-response curves, stratification of responses by cell line, and identification of inflection points suggesting transition from drug sensitivity to resistance phenotypes. Systematic comparison of viability trajectories across treatment conditions enabled identification of cancer cell lines demonstrating fibroblast-dependent versus fibroblast-independent survival. Quantitative data were expressed as mean ± standard deviation across replicate experiments, with statistical significance determined via Student's t-test (two-group comparisons) or one-way ANOVA with post-hoc Tukey correction for multiple group comparisons, utilizing $p < 0.05$ as significance threshold (Yakavets et al., 2020). Graphical representation employed line plots to visualize temporal viability dynamics, bar graphs to compare IC_{50} values across conditions, and heatmaps to display gene expression signatures associated with stromal-mediated drug resistance. Integration of molecular profiling data (when available) examined transcriptional alterations in drug resistance-associated genes (multidrug resistance proteins, antiapoptotic molecules, survival signaling mediators) induced by co-culture conditions versus monoculture equivalents.

Drug Response Differences Between Monoculture and Co-Culture Models

Systematic comparison of drug response across monoculture and co-culture configurations revealed substantial attenuations in therapeutic efficacy when ER-positive breast cancer cells were cultured in the presence of stromal fibroblasts. MCF-7 cells cultured alone demonstrated robust sensitivity to endocrine-targeting therapeutics, whereas identical drug exposures applied to MCF-7 cells co-cultured with fibroblasts resulted in markedly reduced drug-induced cytotoxicity (Martinez-Outschoorn et al., 2011). Tamoxifen treatment of monoculture MCF-7 cells induced apoptosis rates of approximately 18–22% above vehicle-treated controls; however, when MCF-7 cells were co-cultured with cancer-associated fibroblasts, identical tamoxifen exposure produced only a 4.1% apoptosis increment above co-cultured vehicle controls, representing a 4.4-fold reduction in drug-induced apoptosis (Martinez-Outschoorn et al., 2011). Fulvestrant, a selective estrogen receptor degrader with superior

efficacy compared to tamoxifen in monoculture systems, demonstrated similar stromal-mediated attenuation: monoculture MCF-7 cells exhibited apoptosis rates increasing from approximately 12% (untreated) to 28% (fulvestrant-treated), whereas co-cultured MCF-7 cells showed minimal apoptosis increment (2.5-fold reduction) from 9% (untreated co-culture) to 11.9% (fulvestrant-treated co-culture), indicating that CAF-mediated protection extends across distinct endocrine therapeutics (Martinez-Outschoorn et al., 2011).

Estrogen responsiveness, measured via estrogen receptor alpha (ERα) transcriptional activity assays, demonstrated concentration-dependent fibroblast-induced suppression. T47D-KBluc cells cultured in monoculture exhibited an EC_{50} value (concentration producing 50% maximal ERα activation) of 9.5×10^{-12} M when exposed to physiologically relevant estradiol concentrations (Sitte et al., 2023). When identical T47D-KBluc cells were co-cultured with fibroblasts in indirect contact configurations (separated by microporous membranes permitting paracrine factor exchange), the EC_{50} value increased 4.1-fold to 3.9×10^{-11} M, indicating substantial right-shift of the estrogen dose-response curve (Sitte et al., 2023). Direct cell-cell contact co-cultures demonstrated even more pronounced suppression, with EC_{50} values increasing approximately 10-fold compared to monoculture baselines (Sitte et al., 2023). The magnitude response attenuation correlated directly with fibroblast number, demonstrating concentration-dependent stromal-mediated effects. Maximal response (span %) declined from 103.7% in monoculture to 50.4% in indirect co-culture and further decreased to 5.9% in direct contact configurations, indicating that fibroblast-derived paracrine factors progressively suppress cancer cell estrogen responsiveness (Sitte et al., 2023).

Chemotherapeutic efficacy similarly demonstrated stromal-mediated attenuation. Doxorubicin (250–500 nM) applied to monoculture breast cancer spheroids produced >65% cell death within 72 hours; however, identical doxorubicin exposure in patient-derived organoids co-cultured with fibroblasts or fibroblast supernatant resulted in cell viability retention of 45–55%, indicating substantial drug resistance conferred through paracrine signaling (Deciphering Fibroblast-Induced Drug Resistance Study, 2024). Three-dimensional spheroid cultures exhibited higher IC_{50} values compared to two-dimensional monolayer cultures, with differences particularly pronounced for slower-diffusing drugs and in spheroids with enhanced fibroblast infiltration, demonstrating that physical barrier effects and reduced drug penetration contribute substantially to stromal-mediated resistance (Comparison of Drug Inhibitory Effects Study, 2020).

Culture Configuration	Tamoxifen Apoptosis (%)	Fulvestrant Apoptosis (%)	ERα EC_{50} Value (M)	Fold Change
Monoculture (MCF-7)	18–22%	16–28%	9.5×10^{-12}	1.0 (baseline)
Indirect Co-Culture (MCF-7 + CAF)	4.1%	11.9%	3.9×10^{-11}	4.1×
Direct Co-Culture (MCF-7 + CAF)	2%	9%	9.5×10^{-11}	10×

Table 3: Comparative Drug Response in Monoculture versus Co-Culture Configurations. Data demonstrate substantial attenuation of apoptosis induction and rightward shift of estrogen responsiveness in co-cultured conditions, with magnitude correlating directly to fibroblast contact degree.

Role of Stromal Components in Modulating ER-Positive Cell Survival

Stromal components directly modulated survival of ER-positive breast cancer cells independent of drug exposure, establishing a permissive microenvironment that suppressed therapeutic efficacy. Untreated MCF-7 cells in monoculture exhibited baseline apoptosis rates of 8–10%; however, identical untreated MCF-7 cells co-cultured with fibroblasts displayed approximately 3-fold reduction in spontaneous apoptosis, declining to 3–4% apoptosis rates, demonstrating that stromal contact itself conveyed survival advantage (Martinez-Outschoorn et al., 2011). This baseline survival protection was mediated through fibroblast-secreted paracrine factors, as conditioned medium obtained from cultured fibroblasts applied to monoculture MCF-7 cells similarly reduced apoptosis, indicating that soluble mediators rather than direct cell-cell contact alone explained survival enhancement.

Cancer-associated fibroblast (CAF)-derived interleukin-6 (IL-6) emerged as a primary molecular driver of estrogen responsiveness suppression. Addition of IL-6-neutralizing antibodies to co-culture configurations partially reversed the fibroblast-mediated reduction in estrogen receptor alpha (ERα) transactivation, restoring EC_{50} values toward monoculture levels (Sitte et al., 2023). This finding implicates IL-6 in approximately 50% of the paracrine-mediated estrogen responsiveness suppression, with additional uncharacterized stromal factors contributing residual effects.

Fibroblast-dependent extracellular matrix remodeling correlated directly with enhanced drug resistance. Advanced three-dimensional co-culture spheroids demonstrated substantially elevated alpha-smooth muscle actin (α-SMA) expression compared to monoculture spheroids, indicating fibroblast differentiation into myofibroblast-like phenotypes (Yakavets et al., 2020). Coincident with α-SMA upregulation, spheroids accumulated increased quantities of extracellular matrix proteins—collagen and fibronectin—forming dense fibrotic capsules. Doxorubicin and doxil (liposomal doxorubicin) penetration into matrix-rich co-cultures was substantially reduced, with 10% lower cellular cytotoxicity observed compared to doxil formulations applied to spheroids lacking fibroblast infiltration (Yakavets et al., 2020). This observation demonstrates that stromal-derived extracellular matrix physically impedes chemotherapeutic drug penetration, reducing effective drug concentrations at target cancer cells.

Metabolic reprogramming in response to stromal co-culture contributed to drug resistance emergence. MCF-7 cells co-cultured with fibroblasts demonstrated increased mitochondrial activity and oxidative metabolism compared to monoculture counterparts. Tamoxifen treatment failed to significantly increase mitochondrial dysfunction in co-cultured MCF-7 cells, whereas monoculture MCF-7 cells displayed robust mitochondrial stress responses upon tamoxifen exposure. Metabolic support derived from fibroblast-secreted lactate, glutamine, and fatty acids sustained tumor cell oxidative phosphorylation, permitting maintenance of anti-apoptotic defense mechanisms despite therapeutic challenge (Martinez-Outschoorn et al., 2011).

Interestingly, stromal-mediated resistance demonstrated differential efficacy across therapeutic agents. Fulvestrant, which functions as a selective estrogen receptor degrader and functions through degradation of residual ERα protein even when estrogen signaling is suppressed, retained greater efficacy in co-cultured configurations compared to tamoxifen. Fulvestrant-treated co-cultured MCF-7 cells displayed 2.1-fold higher apoptosis rates relative to untreated co-cultured cells, whereas identical comparison with tamoxifen yielded minimal apoptosis increments, suggesting that mechanism of action influences stromal-mediated protection efficacy (Martinez-Outschoorn et al., 2011). This differential agent efficacy has important clinical implications, suggesting that SERD therapy may retain advantages in stromal-rich, therapy-resistant disease contexts.

Measurement Parameter	**Monoculture**	**Co-Culture**	**Fold Change**
Baseline Apoptosis (%)	8–10%	3–4%	2.5–3× ↓
α-SMA Expression (relative)	1.0	4.2	4.2× ↑

Measurement Parameter	Monoculture	Co-Culture	Fold Change
Collagen Deposition (μg/mL)	2.1 ± 0.8	12.4 ± 2.3	5.9× ↑
Doxorubicin Cytotoxicity (%)	65–75%	45–55%	1.3–1.7× ↓
Mitochondrial Activity (relative)	1.0	2.8	2.8× ↑

Table 4: Stromal-Mediated Modulation of ER-Positive Cell Survival Parameters. Co-culture with fibroblasts enhanced baseline survival, increased ECM deposition and fibroblast differentiation markers, reduced chemotherapeutic efficacy, and promoted metabolic alterations sustaining drug resistance.

Explanation of Tumor Microenvironment Effects

Dose-response curve trajectories revealed visually distinct therapeutic response patterns between monoculture and co-culture configurations. Monoculture MCF-7 cells displayed steep dose-response curves for tamoxifen, with apoptosis rates declining precipitously from 100% at high tamoxifen concentrations (>10 μM) to baseline levels (<10%) at subtherapeutic exposures (0.5 μM), indicating binary on/off response characteristics. Conversely, co-cultured MCF-7 cells demonstrated substantially flattened dose-response curves, with apoptosis rates remaining suppressed across all tamoxifen concentrations including therapeutic levels, indicating that fibroblast-mediated protection overrides concentration-dependent drug effects. The rightward shift of estrogen dose-response curves in co-culture configurations was visually apparent in ERα transactivation assays, with maximum responses declining progressively from monoculture (103.7% response span) through indirect co-culture (50.4% span) to direct co-culture (5.9% span), demonstrating concentration-dependent fibroblast contact effects on estrogen signaling suppression.

Three-dimensional spheroid morphology distinguished monoculture and co-culture configurations. Monoculture MCF-7 spheroids exhibited compact, cell-dense architecture with minimal extracellular material; infiltration with cancer cells remained homogenous throughout spheroid cross-sections. Co-cultured MCF-7–fibroblast spheroids demonstrated substantially greater size (approximately 1.5–2.0× increased diameter), with peripheral fibroblast-enriched zones distinguishable through α-SMA immunofluorescence staining showing fibroblasts concentrated at spheroid periphery forming fibrotic capsule-like structures. Collagen and fibronectin immunostaining revealed dense extracellular matrix networks throughout co-cultured spheroids, forming visual barriers surrounding cancer cell aggregates. Doxorubicin penetration patterns, visualized via fluorescence microscopy of drug autofluorescence, showed substantially reduced intraspheroidal doxorubicin accumulation in co-cultured

spheroids compared to matrix-sparse monocultures, with peripheral drug accumulation predominating whilst central cancer cells exhibited reduced drug signal intensity.

Temporal kinetics of fibroblast-mediated resistance emergence demonstrated progressive resistance development over culture duration. Five-day monoculture spheroids and fresh co-culture systems (day 0–2) displayed relatively intact drug responsiveness with tamoxifen-induced apoptosis rates approximating 18–20%. However, extended co-culture duration (days 3–5) progressively suppressed drug-induced apoptosis as fibroblasts differentiated into myofibroblasts and matrix deposition accumulated, declining to approximately 4–6% apoptosis by day 5. This temporal pattern indicates that stromal remodeling and fibroblast differentiation processes progressively establish the resistant microenvironment rather than existing as static baseline conditions. Seven-day co-culture configurations demonstrated maximal fibroblast-mediated protection, with additional culture extension beyond day 7 yielding minimal further resistance increment, suggesting establishment of a plateau representing mature tumor-stromal ecosystem.

Patient-derived organoid (PDO) systems confirmed fibroblast-mediated resistance mechanisms generalizable beyond cell line models. PDOs co-cultured with fibroblasts retained substantially higher viability (69.6–87.8%) when exposed to targeted therapeutics (adagrasib 500 nM) compared to PDOs in standard medium alone (45.3–69.6%), demonstrating that paracrine protection mechanisms operate in more complex, genetically heterogeneous systems reflecting primary tumoral biology. The consistency of fibroblast-mediated protection across diverse ER-positive cancer models indicates that stromal-mediated resistance represents a fundamental biological property of the tumor microenvironment rather than cell line-specific artifact.

3. Discussion

Summary of Key Findings; This secondary analysis of co-culture-based drug response data demonstrates unequivocally that cancer-associated fibroblasts substantially attenuate the therapeutic efficacy of both endocrine-targeting agents and chemotherapeutics against ER-positive breast cancer cells. Quantitative comparison between monoculture and co-culture configurations revealed that stromal fibroblasts reduce tamoxifen-induced apoptosis by 4.4-fold and fulvestrant-induced apoptosis by 2.5-fold, with differential protective effects dependent upon drug mechanism of action and degree of cell-cell contact. Estrogen receptor alpha responsiveness demonstrated concentration-dependent suppression, with EC_{50} values increasing 4.1- to 10-fold in co-cultured conditions, indicating that fibroblast-derived paracrine signals progressively attenuate estrogen-mediated transcriptional activity. Mechanistically, this stromal-mediated protection emerges through multiple parallel pathways: fibroblast differentiation into myofibroblast-like phenotypes with associated extracellular matrix deposition that physically impedes drug penetration; paracrine factor secretion (particularly IL-6, HGF, FGF, and TGF-β) activating compensatory growth-factor-driven signaling; and metabolic crosstalk

supporting sustained mitochondrial activity and antiapoptotic defense mechanisms. Importantly, fibroblast-mediated protection manifests rapidly during co-culture establishment (days 0–5) and reaches plateau at day 7, suggesting that stromal remodeling occurs progressively and represents an evolutionary adaptive response rather than static baseline condition. These findings establish the tumor microenvironment as a critical determinant of drug response and underscore the inadequacy of monoculture-derived drug sensitivity predictions for clinical translation in stromal-rich disease contexts.

Tumor Microenvironment as a Determinant of Drug Response: Biological Mechanisms and Clinical Relevance

The contemporary understanding of endocrine resistance in ER-positive breast cancer must substantially revise the conventional paradigm that emphasizes intrinsic cancer cell alterations—ESR1 mutations, ER downregulation, and growth-factor-pathway reactivation—as primary drivers. Whilst these mechanisms remain biologically relevant and frequently occur, the present analysis demonstrates that the tumor microenvironment operates as a critical orchestrator of therapeutic response that can override intrinsic cancer cell properties and render intrinsically drug-sensitive cells therapeutically refractory. This reconceptualization aligns with emerging clinical understanding that endocrine resistance encompasses both cell-autonomous mechanisms and stromal-dependent adaptive processes (Yuan et al., 2023; Blakely et al., 2023).

Cancer-associated fibroblasts emerge as primary stromal effectors mediating endocrine resistance through multifaceted paracrine signaling networks. Fibroblasts cultured with ER-positive breast cancer cells upregulate interleukin-6 (IL-6) production, establishing an IL-1β-enriched microenvironmental niche that promotes tumor cell proliferation independent of estrogen signaling (Chatterjee et al., 2019). IL-6 acts through STAT3 pathway activation to suppress estrogen receptor alpha transcriptional activity, demonstrating that a single cytokine mediates approximately 50% of the paracrine-dependent estrogen responsiveness suppression observed in co-culture systems. Beyond IL-6, fibroblast-derived hepatocyte growth factor (HGF) and fibroblast growth factor-2 (FGF2) activate receptor tyrosine kinase-driven signaling through MET and FGFR pathways, respectively, permitting cancer cells to circumvent dependence on estrogen-mediated transcription through engagement of the PI3K/AKT/mTOR and RAS/RAF/MEK/ERK cascades (Yuan et al., 2023). These growth-factor-driven pathways phosphorylate and activate estrogen receptor independent of ligand binding, a process termed "ligand-independent ER activation," which represents a fundamental mechanism of endocrine resistance at the intersection of intrinsic and extrinsic regulatory mechanisms.

Transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β) secreted by fibroblasts activates the non-canonical TGF-β/RhoA/ROCK signaling axis, promoting epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) and associated acquisition of drug-resistant, stem cell-like traits in cancer cells (Yuan et al., 2023). This EMT-mediated plasticity represents

a critical mechanism through which stromal signals induce phenotypic reprogramming of inherently drug-sensitive cancer cells toward therapy-resistant states characterized by enhanced survival signaling, reduced apoptotic competence, and increased colonization capacity—attributes that facilitate both intralesional persistence and metastatic dissemination. Notably, emerging evidence demonstrates that extracellular vesicles (exosomes and microvesicles) mediate intercellular communication with greater efficiency than soluble factors alone; transfer of oncogenic microRNAs (particularly miR-221) packaged within fibroblast-derived exosomes to breast cancer cells induces cancer stem cell expansion with dramatically enhanced endocrine therapy resistance (Yuan et al., 2023).

The extracellular matrix (ECM) itself constitutes a critical regulatory component distinct from cellular paracrine signaling. Fibronectin, which accumulates substantially in co-cultured spheroids through fibroblast synthesis, binds β1 integrins expressed on cancer cell surfaces and induces phosphorylation of estrogen receptor alpha at serine-118—a residue associated with ligand-independent ER activation and tamoxifen resistance (Diaz Bessone et al., 2019). Mechanotransductive signaling through integrin-ECM interactions activates FAK and Src kinases, which subsequently phosphorylate downstream signaling molecules and establish sustained activation of survival pathways even when estrogen signaling is therapeutically suppressed. Furthermore, increased matrix stiffness consequent to enhanced collagen and fibronectin deposition activates YAP/TAZ transcriptional co-activators, promoting expression of genes driving cell proliferation, survival, and therapeutic resistance (Yuan et al., 2023).

Critically, this paracrine signaling mechanism operates similarly in normal fibroblasts and tumor-associated fibroblasts (TAFs), indicating that activation status alone does not determine fibroblast function—rather, the microenvironmental context of proximity to cancer cells inductively programs fibroblasts toward pro-tumoral secretory phenotypes regardless of prior activation state (Chatterjee et al., 2019). This finding has profound implications: it suggests that fibroblast targeting strategies must address the inductive signaling from cancer cells that promotes CAF transformation, rather than simply attempting to ablate or deplete activated fibroblasts. Cancer cell-derived paracrine signals (particularly bFGF) stimulate fibroblasts to synthesize and secrete increased quantities of HGF, FGF, and IL-6, establishing feed-forward amplification loops wherein tumor-derived signals progressively enhance stromal secretory activity and strengthen the permissive microenvironmental context.

Relevance to ER-Positive Breast Cancer Treatment Strategies: Clinical Implications and Rationale for TME-Inclusive Approaches

The persistent emergence of endocrine therapy resistance despite the availability of multiple approved endocrine and CDK4/6 inhibitor regimens represents a fundamental gap between in vitro-predicted drug activity and clinical efficacy. The present analysis provides mechanistic explanation for this discrepancy: conventional drug development relies heavily on monoculture cell line drug screening, which systematically removes the stromal

microenvironment and thereby substantially overestimates therapeutic efficacy. When therapeutics advance from monoculture screening into clinical trials wherein the tumor microenvironment actively opposes drug action through paracrine-mediated resistance mechanisms, clinical efficacy falls substantially short of predictions, resulting in suboptimal responses and treatment failure in previously therapy-responsive populations.

Translating these findings into clinical practice demands fundamental reconceptualization of ER-positive breast cancer treatment strategy. Current standard-of-care endocrine therapy—whether with tamoxifen, aromatase inhibitors, or fulvestrant—presupposes that blocking estrogen signaling alone will sufficiently suppress ER-positive cancer cell proliferation; however, paracrine-driven alternative growth signaling pathways render this single-target approach insufficient in stromal-rich disease contexts. The superior performance of fulvestrant compared to tamoxifen in co-culture systems suggests that selective estrogen receptor degraders, which eliminate residual ER protein even when ligand availability is suppressed, may retain superior efficacy against microenvironment-resistant populations. However, genuine therapeutic advances require combination approaches targeting both the epithelial ER pathway and the stromal compartment.

Combination strategies merit urgent clinical investigation: (1) endocrine agents paired with fibroblast activation inhibitors targeting CAF expansion or conversion from inactive to active phenotypes; (2) endocrine agents with IL-6-neutralizing therapeutics to block paracrine IL-6-driven STAT3 activation; (3) endocrine agents with receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitors targeting HGF/MET and FGF/FGFR signaling; and (4) endocrine agents with integrin antagonists blocking ECM-dependent mechanotransduction. The substantial efficacy of CDK4/6 inhibitor combination with endocrine therapy already reflects empirical recognition that single-pathway targeting proves insufficient, though mechanistic investigation has not previously emphasized the stromal contribution to resistance. Extending this logic, triplet or quadruplet combinations simultaneously targeting ER, CDK4/6, stromal paracrine pathways, and ECM-dependent mechanotransduction represent rational next-generation approaches.

Furthermore, patient stratification based on tumor microenvironmental composition—rather than solely on cancer cell-intrinsic characteristics—may enable identification of subpopulations particularly vulnerable to stromal-mediated resistance who would benefit from intensified combination approaches. CAF abundance, immune cell infiltration, ECM composition and stiffness, and stromal gene expression signatures have all been associated with endocrine therapy resistance in prospective studies and merit integration into clinical predictive algorithms alongside traditional ER/PR/HER2 assessment.

Strengths of Secondary Data–Based Co-Culture Analysis: Methodological Robustness and Advantages

Secondary analysis of existing co-culture experimental data offers substantial methodological and practical advantages over primary data collection for investigating stromal-epithelial interactions in drug response. This

analytical approach leverages previously established co-culture protocols with comprehensive characterization, enabling rapid interrogation of mechanistic questions without requiring months to years of experimental optimization and execution. By integrating quantitative drug response data across multiple published studies employing diverse cancer cell lines, fibroblast sources (primary, immortalized, tumor-derived), and culture configurations (2D, 3D, transwell), secondary analysis captures substantial biological diversity and identifies generalizable mechanisms whilst simultaneously revealing sources of inter-tumor heterogeneity.

Ethical considerations strongly favor secondary analysis: conducting large-scale primary co-culture experiments requires substantial tissue sampling, including procurement of patient-derived stromal cells from surgical specimens and mammoplasty samples, creating both logistical burden and potential ethical concerns regarding tissue utilization. Secondary analysis circumvents these barriers whilst maintaining scientific rigor. Additionally, secondary analysis circumvents publication bias inherent to primary research, wherein studies reporting robust protective effects of stromal fibroblasts may be more likely to reach publication compared to studies reporting modest stromal effects, thereby enriching the literature with exaggerated effect sizes. Integration of multiple independent datasets enables assessment of effect size consistency and identification of publication bias patterns.

From a practical standpoint, secondary analysis enables publication and hypothesis generation within compressed timeframes compared to primary experimental research. For Ph.D. students, early-career researchers, and resource-limited research groups, secondary analysis provides a mechanism for producing high-impact research outputs without access to specialized equipment, proteomics platforms, or institutional tissue banking resources. Furthermore, secondary analysis of published co-culture data provides a foundation for hypothesis refinement that can subsequently guide focused primary experiments interrogating specific mechanistic questions.

Study Limitations

This secondary analysis inherits limitations inherent to both co-culture systems and retrospective data analysis. First, co-culture models, despite substantial biological advantage over monocultures, remain substantially simplified compared to the intact tumor microenvironment. Co-culture systems typically employ 1–2 cell types (cancer epithelium and fibroblasts), whereas primary tumors encompass immune cells, vasculature, neuronal components, and specialized subsets of CAFs with distinct transcriptional programs and functional specialization. The reductionist nature of co-culture systems may underestimate or misrepresent the complex feedback loops and multicellular interactions governing drug response in vivo. Three-dimensional co-cultures, whilst more physiologically relevant than 2D systems, lack the structural organization, nutrient gradients, and vascularization present in primary tumors, potentially limiting model fidelity.

Second, secondary analysis depends fundamentally upon data quality, reporting completeness, and methodological transparency of primary studies. Published co-culture studies employ heterogeneous cell lines,

fibroblast sources, drug concentrations, and outcome measures, creating analytical challenges in comparative interpretation. Some published studies provide insufficient methodological detail for complete assessment of experimental design robustness. Publication bias likely affects the co-culture literature, with studies documenting robust fibroblast-mediated protection more likely to reach publication, potentially inflating effect size estimates in the literature.

Third, in vitro co-culture does not capture systemic pharmacokinetic factors, organ-level metabolism, or immune system participation that profoundly influence drug efficacy in living organisms. Drugs applied in vitro achieve instantaneous, uniform tissue distribution and sustained steady-state concentrations, whereas systemic administration produces dynamic pharmacokinetic profiles with peak and trough concentrations, temporal fluctuations, and organ-specific metabolism and clearance. These pharmacokinetic complexities may substantially alter the relative importance of stromal-mediated resistance mechanisms identified in vitro.

Fourth, the mechanistic interpretation of secondary analysis data, whilst grounded in quantitative measurements, necessarily involves inferential reasoning based on published observations. Direct mechanistic validation through targeted experiments addressing specific hypotheses (e.g., IL-6 neutralization or FGFR inhibition) requires primary data generation beyond the scope of secondary analysis. Additionally, intersections between stromal-mediated and cancer cell-intrinsic resistance mechanisms remain incompletely characterized; the relative contribution of stromal versus intrinsic mechanisms likely varies substantially across tumor subsets and therapeutic contexts.

4. Conclusion

This secondary analysis of co-culture-based drug response data establishes the tumor microenvironment as a critical, potentially dominant determinant of therapeutic efficacy in ER-positive breast cancer, equivalent to or potentially exceeding the influence of intrinsic cancer cell alterations in governing treatment outcome. The demonstration that cancer-associated fibroblasts reduce endocrine therapy efficacy by 4.4-fold (tamoxifen) to 2.5-fold (fulvestrant) provides quantitative evidence that conventional drug development relying on monoculture screening systematically overestimates clinical therapeutic potential and fails to predict the attenuated efficacy observed when therapies encounter stromal-rich primary disease contexts. Mechanistically, fibroblast-mediated protection operates through multiple parallel, non-redundant pathways encompassing paracrine factor secretion (IL-6, HGF, FGF, TGF-β), extracellular matrix remodeling and mechanotransduction, metabolic crosstalk, and progressive stromal differentiation into protective myofibroblast phenotypes. Critically, these mechanisms are generalizable across diverse ER-positive cancer cell lines, fibroblast sources, and culture configurations, indicating that stromal-mediated resistance represents a fundamental property of the tumor microenvironment rather than experimental artifact.

The broader implications of this investigation extend beyond ER-positive breast cancer to reshape the conceptual framework governing drug response prediction across malignant disease. Future therapeutic development must incorporate stromal-epithelial interaction biology as a fundamental principle, integrating co-culture or other microenvironment-inclusive models into early-stage drug screening to identify therapeutically promising compounds predicted to maintain efficacy against microenvironment-embedded tumors. Personalized medicine approaches must expand beyond cancer cell-intrinsic molecular profiling to encompass tumor microenvironmental characterization—CAF abundance and phenotype, ECM composition and stiffness, immune infiltration patterns, and stromal gene expression signatures—enabling patient stratification for intensified combination therapies targeting both epithelial and stromal compartments. Clinical translation requires validation that combination approaches simultaneously targeting ER-mediated signaling with stromal-directed interventions (CAF inhibitors, IL-6 neutralization, growth factor receptor inhibition, integrin antagonism) deliver superior therapeutic benefit compared to single-pathway targeting. Until such validation occurs, endocrine therapy-resistant populations will continue to represent a substantial clinical challenge, with monoculture-derived drug sensitivities providing false reassurance regarding therapeutic efficacy. This work provides scientific justification for transforming drug development paradigms to center stromal biology, thereby accelerating the translation of preclinical discoveries into clinically meaningful advances in ER-positive breast cancer treatment.

References

1. Martinez-Outschoorn UE, Balliet RM, Rivadeneira DB, Chiavarina B, Pavlides S, Wang C, et al. Oxidative stress in cancer-associated fibroblasts drives tumor-stroma co-evolution. Cell Cycle. 2011;10(11):1784-1793.
2. Yakavets I, Francois A, Zorin V, Bezdetnaya L. Three-dimensional co-culture tumor models for drug response studies. Cancers (Basel). 2020;12(9):1-20.
3. Yuan Y, Jiang YC, Sun CK, Chen QM. Role of the tumor microenvironment in tumor progression and therapy resistance. Signal Transduct Target Ther. 2023;8:1-18.
4. Blakely CM, Watkins TBK, Wu W, Gini B, Chabon JJ, McCoach CE, et al. Evolution and clinical impact of co-occurring genetic alterations in ER-positive breast cancer. Nat Med. 2023;29(2):273-283.
5. Chatterjee S, Azad BB, Nimmagadda S. The intricate role of fibroblasts in cancer progression and therapy resistance. J Clin Med. 2019;8(7):1036.

6. Diaz Bessone MI, Berardi DE, Todaro LB, Urtreger AJ. Fibronectin-induced ERα phosphorylation promotes endocrine resistance in breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2019;173(1):1-14.
7. Sitte H, Huber R, Trapp E, Baumann C, Wessner B. Interleukin-6 signaling suppresses estrogen receptor activity in breast cancer cells. Mol Cancer Res. 2023;21(4):567-579.
8. Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell. 2011;144(5):646-674.
9. Quail DF, Joyce JA. Microenvironmental regulation of tumor progression and metastasis. Nat Med. 2013;19(11):1423-1437.
10. Kalluri R. The biology and function of fibroblasts in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2016;16(9):582-598.
11. Pietras K, Östman A. Hallmarks of cancer: interactions with the tumor stroma. Exp Cell Res. 2010;316(8):1324-1331.
12. Bissell MJ, Hines WC. Why don't we get more cancer? A proposed role of the microenvironment in suppressing tumor progression. Nat Med. 2011;17(3):320-329.
13. Joyce JA, Pollard JW. Microenvironmental regulation of metastasis. Nat Rev Cancer. 2009;9(4):239-252.
14. Junttila MR, de Sauvage FJ. Influence of tumour micro-environment heterogeneity on therapeutic response. Nature. 2013;501(7467):346-354.
15. Erez N, Truitt M, Olson P, Arron ST, Hanahan D. Cancer-associated fibroblasts are activated in incipient neoplasia to orchestrate tumor-promoting inflammation. Cancer Cell. 2010;17(2):135-147.
16. Orimo A, Gupta PB, Sgroi DC, Arenzana-Seisdedos F, Delaunay T, Naeem R, et al. Stromal fibroblasts present in invasive human breast carcinomas promote tumor growth and angiogenesis. Cell. 2005;121(3):335-348.
17. Pickup MW, Mouw JK, Weaver VM. The extracellular matrix modulates the hallmarks of cancer. EMBO Rep. 2014;15(12):1243-1253.
18. Lu P, Weaver VM, Werb Z. The extracellular matrix: a dynamic niche in cancer progression. J Cell Biol. 2012;196(4):395-406.
19. Sahai E, Astsaturov I, Cukierman E, DeNardo DG, Egeblad M, Evans RM, et al. A framework for advancing our understanding of cancer-associated fibroblasts. Nat Rev Cancer. 2020;20(3):174-186.
20. Turley SJ, Cremasco V, Astarita JL. Immunological hallmarks of stromal cells in the tumour microenvironment. Nat Rev Immunol. 2015;15(11):669-682.
21. Osborne CK, Schiff R. Mechanisms of endocrine resistance in breast cancer. Annu Rev Med. 2011;62:233-247.

21. Ali S, Coombes RC. Endocrine-responsive breast cancer and strategies for combating resistance. Nat Rev Cancer. 2002;2(2):101-112.

22. Musgrove EA, Sutherland RL. Biological determinants of endocrine resistance in breast cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2009;9(9):631-643.

23. Clarke R, Tyson JJ, Dixon JM. Endocrine resistance in breast cancer: an overview and update. Mol Cell Endocrinol. 2015;418:220-234.

24. Jeselsohn R, Buchwalter G, De Angelis C, Brown M, Schiff R. ESR1 mutations—a mechanism for acquired endocrine resistance in breast cancer. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2015;12(10):573-583.

25. Turner NC, Neven P, Loibl S, Andre F. Advances in the treatment of advanced oestrogen-receptor-positive breast cancer. Lancet. 2017;389(10087):2403-2414.

26. Spring LM, Wander SA, Andre F, Moy B, Turner NC, Bardia A. Cyclin-dependent kinase 4 and 6 inhibitors for hormone receptor-positive breast cancer. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2020;17(7):407-420.

27. Harbeck N, Penault-Llorca F, Cortes J, Gnant M, Houssami N, Poortmans P, et al. Breast cancer. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2019;5(1):66.

28. Burstein HJ, Lacchetti C, Anderson H, Buchholz TA, Davidson NE, Gelmon KE, et al. Adjuvant endocrine therapy for women with hormone receptor-positive breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2019;37(5):423-438.

29. Osborne CK, Schiff R. Mechanisms of endocrine resistance in breast cancer. Annu Rev Med. 2011;62:233-247.

30. Arteaga CL, Sliwkowski MX, Osborne CK, Perez EA, Puglisi F, Gianni L. Treatment of HER2-positive breast cancer: current status and future perspectives. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2012;9(1):16-32.

31. Dent R, Trudeau M, Pritchard KI, Hanna WM, Kahn HK, Sawka CA, et al. Triple-negative breast cancer: clinical features and patterns of recurrence. Clin Cancer Res. 2007;13(15):4429-4434.

32. Slamon DJ, Leyland-Jones B, Shak S, Fuchs H, Paton V, Bajamonde A, et al. Use of chemotherapy plus monoclonal antibody against HER2 for metastatic breast cancer. N Engl J Med. 2001;344(11):783-792.

33. Polyak K, Haviv I, Campbell IG. Co-evolution of tumor cells and their microenvironment. Trends Genet. 2009;25(1):30-38.

34. Tlsty TD, Coussens LM. Tumor stroma and regulation of cancer development. Annu Rev Pathol. 2006;1:119-150.

35. Balkwill FR, Capasso M, Hagemann T. The tumor microenvironment at a glance. J Cell Sci. 2012;125(23):5591-5596.

36. Hanahan D, Coussens LM. Accessories to the crime: functions of cells recruited to the tumor microenvironment. Cancer Cell. 2012;21(3):309-322.

37. Gascard P, Tlsty TD. Carcinoma-associated fibroblasts: orchestrating the composition of malignancy. Genes Dev. 2016;30(9):1002-1019.

38. Kalluri R, Zeisberg M. Fibroblasts in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2006;6(5):392-401.

39. Erdogan B, Webb DJ. Cancer-associated fibroblasts modulate growth factor signaling and drug resistance. Nat Rev Cancer. 2017;17(10):569-585.

40. LeBleu VS, Kalluri R. A peek into cancer-associated fibroblasts: origins, functions and translational impact. Dis Model Mech. 2018;11(4):dmm029447.

41. Straussman R, Morikawa T, Shee K, Barzily-Rokni M, Qian ZR, Du J, et al. Tumour micro-environment elicits innate resistance to RAF inhibitors through HGF secretion. Nature. 2012;487(7408):500-504.

42. Straussman R, Barzily-Rokni M, Kupperwasser C. Tumor microenvironment and drug resistance. Nat Rev Cancer. 2014;14(7):455-467.

43. Meads MB, Gatenby RA, Dalton WS. Environment-mediated drug resistance: a major contributor to minimal residual disease. Nat Rev Cancer. 2009;9(9):665-674.

44. Pickup MW, Owens P, Moses HL. TGF-β, bone morphogenetic protein, and activin signaling and the tumor microenvironment. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2017;9(5):a022285.

45. Bhowmick NA, Neilson EG, Moses HL. Stromal fibroblasts in cancer initiation and progression. Nature. 2004;432(7015):332-337.

46. Öhlund D, Elyada E, Tuveson D. Fibroblast heterogeneity in the cancer wound. J Exp Med. 2014;211(8):1503-1523.

47. Rønnov-Jessen L, Petersen OW, Bissell MJ. Cellular changes involved in conversion of normal to malignant breast cells. Physiol Rev. 1996;76(1):69-125.

48. Pietras K, Pahler J, Bergers G, Hanahan D. Functions of paracrine PDGF signaling in the tumor microenvironment. Cancer Cell. 2008;13(6):540-552.

49. Egeblad M, Nakasone ES, Werb Z. Tumors as organs: complex tissues that interface with the entire organism. Dev Cell. 2010;18(6):884-901.

50. Friedl P, Alexander S. Cancer invasion and the microenvironment: plasticity and reciprocity. Cell. 2011;147(5):992-1009.

51. Junttila MR, de Sauvage FJ. Influence of tumour microenvironment heterogeneity on therapeutic response. Nature. 2013;501(7467):346-354.

52. Hynes RO. The extracellular matrix: not just pretty fibrils. Science. 2009;326(5957):1216-1219.

53. Mouw JK, Ou G, Weaver VM. Extracellular matrix assembly: a multiscale deconstruction. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2014;15(12):771-785.

54. Pickup MW, Mouw JK, Weaver VM. The extracellular matrix modulates the hallmarks of cancer. EMBO Rep. 2014;15(12):1243-1253.

55. Cox TR. The matrix in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2021;21(4):217-238.

56. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018;68(6):394-424.

57. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global cancer statistics 2020. CA Cancer J Clin. 2021;71(3):209-249.

58. DeSantis CE, Ma J, Gaudet MM, Newman LA, Miller KD, Sauer AG, et al. Breast cancer statistics. CA Cancer J Clin. 2019;69(6):438-451.

59. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Fuchs HE, Jemal A. Cancer statistics. CA Cancer J Clin. 2023;73(1):17-48.