



## VASP involvement in force-mediated adherens junction strengthening

Anita S. Kris<sup>a</sup>, Roger D. Kamm<sup>a</sup>, Alisha L. Sieminski<sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Biological Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

<sup>b</sup> Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering, Olin Way, Needham, MA 02492, USA

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 28 July 2008

Available online 3 August 2008

#### Keywords:

Adherens junction  
Adhesion strengthening  
Actin  
VE-cadherin  
Ena/VASP

### ABSTRACT

Strengthening of cell-matrix adhesions in response to applied force has been well documented. However, while implied by various lines of evidence, the force-mediated strengthening of cell-cell adhesions has not been directly demonstrated. In the current study, we present results consistent with force strengthening in adherens junctions, obtained by application of different force profiles to VE-cadherin-coated magnetic beads attached to endothelial cells. When force is ramped from a low to high value over time, fewer beads detach than with the immediate application of high force. Cells treated with cytochalasin D or lacking Ena/VASP activity show similar levels of detachment relative to controls, but force strengthening is lost. Further, cells overexpressing VASP show stronger adhesion in response to low and high force, but adhesion weakening in response to ramped forces. These results indicate that force-mediated adhesion strengthening occurs in endothelial adherens junctions and that dynamic VASP activity is necessary for this process.

© 2008 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Cell-cell junctions help to organize cells during development, differentiation, and wound healing, while loss of appropriate cell-cell adhesion is associated with a loss of differentiation and an invasive phenotype in tumorigenic cells [1–4]. These functions are regulated, in part, by force transmission between cells, as evidenced by abnormal development of load-bearing tissues such as the heart in the absence of key adhesion molecules [5,6]. In addition, tension across adherens junctions appears to play a role in functions ranging from maintenance of epithelial barrier function and polarity [7,8] to cell survival and proliferation [9,10].

Cell-cell adhesions, like the somewhat more familiar cell-matrix adhesions, are dynamic structures that allow cells to interact with their external environment by providing biochemical signals as well as mechanical linkages between the outside and inside of a cell. Adherens junctions are defined by homophilic binding of transmembrane cadherins molecules on adjacent cells. Intracellularly, cadherins bind to numerous molecules involved in signaling, which provides the mechanical link to the actin cytoskeleton, again analogous to focal adhesions [11].

Given their functional similarity, it is not surprising that focal adhesions and adherens junctions share many linker molecules (e.g. vinculin, zyxin, VASP) and involvement of the force-responsive G proteins, Rho, Rac, and Cdc42 in formation and stabilization [12]. Molecules, such as  $\alpha$ -catenin and  $\beta$ -catenin, are specific to adherens junctions [9,13]. Both adherens junctions and focal adhesions follow a similar process of maturation involving actin poly-

merization and recruitment of intracellular linker proteins upon an initial binding event [14–17]. Structures resembling adherens junctions are formed when cadherin-coated beads are allowed to bind to cells, as evidenced by recruitment of the corresponding cadherins,  $\beta$ -catenin, F-actin, and Mena (a member of the Ena/VASP family) in various cells [18,19]. Further it appears that a functional cadherin cytoplasmic tail, actin dynamics, and acto-myosin tension are all needed for formation of cell-cell junctions and to maintain their strength [19–21].

Once cadherins are engaged, adherens junctions exhibit time-dependent adhesion strengthening, much like focal adhesions. For example, while it took  $\sim 20$  nN to separate E-cadherin transfected cells after 30 s of contact, a separation force of  $\sim 200$  nN was required after 1 h of contact although the contact area remained virtually unchanged [16]. Disruption of actin dynamics and/or polymerization had no effect on the early separation force but decreased the force needed to separate the cells at later times [16]. Similarly, disruption of actin in endothelial cells, which express VE-cadherin, increased the number of VE-cadherin-coated beads which detached under applied force [19]. Though there are many compositional similarities between focal adhesions and adherens junctions, both strengthen similarly with time, and, whereas ample evidence points to focal adhesion strengthening with applied force [22], there is only indirect evidence that force-mediated adhesion strengthening occurs in adherens junctions [9].

Vasodilator-stimulated phosphoprotein (VASP) may be of particular interest in force-mediated adhesion strengthening of adherens junctions as it plays an important role in adherens junction formation and actin organization in epithelial cells [18,23] and

\* Corresponding author. Fax: +1 781 292 2508.

E-mail address: [alisha.sieminski@olin.edu](mailto:alisha.sieminski@olin.edu) (A.L. Sieminski).

recent reports also suggest that Ena/VASP is necessary for the maintenance and strengthening of adherens junctions [8]. VASP localizes to cell–cell junctions, cell–matrix adhesions, stress fibers, and the lamellipodia of migrating cells and its activity is required for appropriate adhesion formation and associated actin polymerization [18,23,24]. Mice lacking members of the Ena/VASP family of proteins have increased endothelial permeability causing fatal vascular leakage and hemorrhaging during development [8]. Further, overexpression of VASP not only enhances barrier function of endothelial cells *in vitro*, it also increases their force generation [8]; loss of Ena/VASP activity causes increased permeability and decreased force generation [8].

The first goal of the present study was to ask whether endothelial adherens junctions exhibit force-mediated adhesion strengthening. This was accomplished by monitoring detachment of VE-cadherin-coated magnetic beads from endothelial cells in response to application of different force profiles. Next, based on available data on the roles of Ena/VASP in cell–cell junctions, we hypothesized that loss of Ena/VASP activity would result in a loss of adherens junction force strengthening. Further, based on the observation that VASP overexpression decreases endothelial permeability but increases force generation, we hypothesized that overexpression of VASP would enhance the strength of adherens junctions and also force strengthening. Our results indicate that cadherin contacts do indeed strengthen in response to applied force, and that changing Ena/VASP activity affects this process.

## Materials and methods

**Cells.** Human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVECs, Cascade Biologics, Portland, OR) were maintained in standard media (EBM-2, Lonza, Allendale, PA). HUVECs stably expressing GFP–VASP (VASP) or GFP–Mito–FPPPP (Mito) as previously described [8] were obtained from Drs. Craig Furman and Frank Gertler (MIT); GFP–VASP appears to be analogous to endogenous VASP with respect to localization and functionality and results in a VASP overexpression phenotype, while GFP–Mito–FPPPP sequesters endogenous Ena/VASP proteins, effectively abrogating their activity [8,25]. For all experiments, cells (passage 5–7) were plated at subconfluence in collagen-coated 35-mm tissue culture petri dishes (10,000–20,000 cells per dish) and allowed to fully attach and recover (12–24 h).

**Magnetic beads.** The bead coating procedure was modified from Baumgartner et al. [26]. Briefly, paramagnetic beads coated in protein A (2.8  $\mu$ m diameter, Dynal/Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) were rinsed in sodium phosphate buffer (100 mM, pH 8.1, from monosodium phosphate and disodium phosphate), incubated in 0.1 mg/ml Fc/VE-cadherin chimeric protein (calculated to correspond occupation of 25% of binding sites, R&D Systems, Minneapolis, MN) in sodium phosphate buffer for 3 min. Beads were then washed 3 times in triethanolamine (200 mM, pH 8.2, Sigma, St. Louis, MO), incubated in 5.4 mg/ml dimethyl pimelimidate dihydrochloride in triethanolamine to crosslink, washed twice for 30 min with 100 mM Tris (pH 7.5), and then 3 times in phosphate buffered saline (PBS, with calcium and magnesium). After coating, beads were stored in PBS for up to 3 months.


**Magnetic trap.** The magnetic trap was built as previously described [27]. Briefly, a CMI-C steel cylinder (161 mm-long and 20 mm diameter) was machined to have a 25° chiseled tip (44 mm long, 250  $\mu$ m wide). The 72 mm-long core was wrapped in eight layers of 18-gauge enamel-coated copper wire to create a magnetic coil with ~400 total turns. Current was provided to the coil by a power supply (PSP-603, Instek, Taiwan). The trap was mounted on a micromanipulator to control its position and the micromanipulator and microscope (Zeiss Axiovert 200) were

mounted on a pneumatic vibration isolation table to minimize forces from other sources.

Calibration was performed by tracking the movement of polystyrene beads suspended in dimethylpolysiloxane with a kinematic viscosity of 12,500 centistokes (0.98 g/cm<sup>3</sup>, DMPS-12M, Sigma) in response to currents applied to the trap in 0.5 A steps from 1.0 to 3.5 A. Bead motion was recorded by a high-speed camera (25 fps, PCO.1200, PCO, Germany) at 50× magnification and then analyzed with particle-tracking software written in MATLAB (Mathworks, Natick, MA, software generously provided by Dr. Jan Lammerding) to obtain velocities. For a given velocity ( $u$ ), force ( $F$ ) was calculated using Stokes' equation,  $F = 3\pi\mu Du$ , where  $\mu$  is dynamic viscosity and  $D$  is bead diameter. Force vs. position data were then fit to the phenomenological power law,  $F = ax^b + c$ . The coefficients ( $n = 3$  trials for 1.0 A and 3.5 A,  $n = 1$  trial for intermediate current values) were averaged to give current–force–distance relationships used for experiments.

**Bead detachment experiments.** Approximately 10,000 VE-cadherin-coated beads were added to adherent HUVECs in 1.2 ml media and placed in the incubator (~10 beads/mm<sup>2</sup>). In drug studies, cytochalasin D was added to culture media (200 nM) during bead incubation; this concentration has previously been shown to disrupt the actin cytoskeleton and remove most actin bundles [28]. After 45 min in the incubator, cell dishes were placed on a preheated aluminum plate connected to resistive heaters on the microscope stage to maintain the media at 37 °C. To test for bead adhesion, cells which were not in contact with other cells and with only one magnetic bead associated with them were identified under the microscope and force of <1 pN was applied for 5 s (current of 1.0 A at a distance of approximately 250  $\mu$ m from the bead); beads that did not appear to move in response to this force were considered sufficiently attached for the experiment.

For adhesion studies, magnetic trap tip was brought parfocal to and 30  $\mu$ m away from a bead and one of three force conditions was applied: (1) low force of 0.7 nN (via application of 1.0 A current) for



**Fig. 1.** Low, high, and ramped force profiles used for cell studies. Different force levels were obtained by holding the magnetic trap tip 30  $\mu$ m from a bead attached to a cell and choosing currents based on trap calibration. The low and high force profiles (dotted and dashed lines, respectively) were application of 0.7 nN or 2.1 nN for 110 s (corresponding to 1.0 A and 3.5 A of current, respectively). The ramped profile increased from 0.7 nN to 2.1 nN by increasing the current 0.5 A every 10 s (corresponding step values are 0.7, 0.9, 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, and 2.1 nN) for 60 s and then holding at 2.1 nN for the remaining 50 s. For each of the six different force levels, error bars show forces correlating to a  $\pm 5$   $\mu$ m difference from 30  $\mu$ m in placement of the magnetic trap. Force–current relationships are based on bead calibration in dimethylpolysiloxane (see Materials and methods).


110 s, (2) high force of 2.1 nN (via application of 3.5 A current) for 110 s, or (3) ramped force from 0.7 to 2.1 nN via a 0.5 A increment in current every 10 s over 50 (corresponding to 0.7, 0.9, 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, and 2.1 nN) and then held at 2.1 nN for 60 s (Fig. 1). Fisher's one-tailed exact test was used to examine significance of differences between detachment rates. The application of currents for the specified periods of time was controlled by MATLAB via RS-232 serial communication. The attachment state of each bead was noted throughout the course of the experiment, with the time of detachment recorded in cases where detachment occurred; detached beads were easily identified and rapidly moved towards the tip. Subsequent tests were conducted on cells that were at least 500  $\mu\text{m}$  away from previously tested cells to avoid confounding pre-stressing forces from previous tests. Each dish was used for a maximum of 30 min to minimize the effects of lowered  $\text{CO}_2$ . Beads coated only with protein A were unable to withstand 0.7 nN of force, indicating specific binding of VE-cadherin-coated beads.

## Results and discussion

Magnetic beads coated with VE-cadherin were allowed to settle and bind to human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVECs) for 45 min and then force was applied to individual beads via a magnetic trap. Low (0.7 nN), high (2.1 nN), and ramped (0.7–2.1 nN) force profiles were applied (Fig. 1) in order to assess whether

force-mediated adhesion strengthening was occurring ( $n > 30$  beads per condition). As expected, a greater number of beads detached when high force (44%,  $p < 0.005$ ) vs. low force (19%) was applied for 110 s (Fig. 2A). Greater than 99% of beads that detached did so within the first 50 s of force application (not shown). If adherens junctions exhibit force-mediated adhesion strengthening, ramping the force from low to high should strengthen the binding between the cell and bead and result in a decrease in detachment with application of high force. Consistent with this prediction, fewer beads detached (32%, not significant), relative to high force conditions, when force was ramped from low to high levels over 50 s and then held at 2.1 nN for 60 s (Fig. 2A).

The level of force required to detach beads can be compared with other experiments. For the present study, if we assume that  $\sim 5\%$  of the bead surface area is in contact with the cell [29], the force applied to the VE-cadherin-mediated adhesion is  $\sim 0.6$ – $1.7 \text{ nN}/\mu\text{m}^2$  for low to high force profiles. Though different cell systems and different cadherins may exhibit a range of binding strengths, this value is of the same order as the  $\sim 4 \text{ nN}/\mu\text{m}^2$  required to separate cells transfected to express E-cadherin after 1 h (comparable to the 45 min adhesion time in the present study) [16]. It is also in the range of traction forces exerted by N-cadherin expressing cells ( $\sim 5 \text{ nN}$ ) on N-cadherin coated polydimethylsiloxane posts [30]. These comparisons support the idea that mature



**Fig. 2.** Percent detachment of VE-cadherin-coated beads on control (A), cytochalasin D treated (B), Ena/VASP inactivated (Mito, C), or VASP-overexpressing (D) HUVEC in response to low (0.7 nN), high (2.1 nN), and ramped (from 0.7 nN to 2.1 nN over 50 s of applied force). A decrease in the number of beads detaching between high and ramped force conditions is consistent with force strengthening (A). Disruption of the actin cytoskeleton or inactivation of Ena/VASP blocks force strengthening (B, C). While overexpression of VASP appears to slightly increase basal binding strength, it also leads to weaker adhesions in the presence of ramped force (D). For a given cell type, significant difference to low force, determined with Fisher's one-tailed exact test ( $p < 0.005$ ), is indicated with (\*). Significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) from the same force profile for control HUVECs is indicated with (+).

adherens junction type adhesions are forming between the endothelial cells and the VE-cadherin-coated beads in our studies.

An intact actin network and functional dynamics are necessary for force-mediated adhesion strengthening of focal adhesions [22] and for time-dependent strengthening of adherens junctions [16]. Thus, we predicted that disrupting actin by treating cells with cytochalasin D (200 nM) would reduce force-mediated adhesion strengthening of adherens junctions. With cytochalasin D treatment, 16% of beads detached in response to low force (Fig. 2B). The observation that similar numbers of beads under control conditions detached at low force suggests that basal adhesion through VE-cadherin was not greatly affected by the application of cytochalasin D. Significantly more (56%,  $p < 0.005$ ) beads detached under high force with cytochalasin D treatment (Fig. 2B), consistent with previous reports [19]. Additionally, adhesion strengthening appears to have been disrupted by cytochalasin D treatment as application of ramping force resulted in detachment of 55% of beads, similar to that seen with high force (Fig. 2B,  $p < 0.005$  relative to low force).

To study the role of Ena/VASP proteins in adhesion strengthening, HUVECs lacking VASP activity (Mito) or overexpressing VASP (VASP) were investigated. Consistent with increased permeability in vessels and cultured endothelial cells lacking VASP activity [8], bead detachment was increased in Mito cells relative to control HUVECs under all conditions (Fig. 2C). Twenty-eight percent, 69%, and 65% of beads detached from Mito cells under low, high, and ramped force profiles, respectively (high and ramped profiles both significantly different from low,  $p < 0.05$ ). The detachment profile for Mito cells appeared to be similar to that of cytochalasin-treated HUVECs, indicating that loss of VASP did not greatly disrupt the VE-cadherin-mediated adhesion, but it also prevented adhesion strengthening.

Given that VASP overexpression decreases permeability [8], likely via increased cell–cell adhesion strength, we predicted that bead adhesion strength would be increased in VASP-overexpressing cells. Consistent with this, we observed that bead detachment was slightly decreased ( $p = 0.054$  for high force) relative to control cells in VASP-overexpressing cells under low (9%) or high (24%) force application (Fig. 2D). Based on this apparent increased basal adhesion strength and the observation that loss of VASP activity inhibited adhesion strengthening, we hypothesized that overexpression of VASP would enhance force strengthening. However, somewhat surprisingly, under ramped force conditions VASP overexpression led to a further increase in bead detachment (39%, Fig. 2D, significantly different from low force,  $p < 0.005$ ). Under these conditions, VASP overexpression appears to have reversed the cells' ability to respond to dynamic changes in force application and led to a weakening of adhesion with ramping force.

A similarly paradoxical effect of VASP has been seen in the context of studying the effect of VASP overexpression on fibroblast migration. VASP increased lamellipodial ruffling, typically thought to promote migration and presumably due to increased polymerization caused by VASP anti-capping activity [25]. However, it also caused a decreased average migration speed due to decreased persistence [25]. In the present study, it is possible that increased actin dynamics due to VASP activity, in combination with force on the adherens adhesion, leads to instability or a slower response which leads to the apparent adhesion weakening. This observation is intriguing given the increased expression of VASP seen in lung adenocarcinoma cells [31]; adhesion weakening in these cells could contribute to the loss of polarity and cell–cell contacts associated with a tumorigenic phenotype.

In summary, we demonstrate here an actin-dependent, VE-cadherin-mediated adhesion strengthening in HUVECs. Though only demonstrated for one specific cadherin, given the importance of tension in maintaining adherens junctions and tissue architecture

[1,6,21], it is likely that adhesion strengthening occurs in adherens junctions containing other types of cadherins. We also expand upon previously published results showing that Ena/VASP proteins are involved in adherens junction formation [8,23] by demonstrating that Ena/VASP activity is necessary for force strengthening of endothelial adherens junctions. However, as shown by the somewhat surprising results obtained with VASP-overexpressing cells, the role of VASP in basal adhesion strength force strengthening may be complex.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank Jan Lammerding and Hayden Huang for their assistance building the magnetic trap, David Quinn for his assistance with the microscope and camera setup, and Craig Furman and Frank Gertler for cells and stimulating discussion on Ena/VASP. This work was partially funded by a NIBIB research Grant from the National Institutes of Health (EB003805).

## References

- [1] R.M. Mege, J. Gavard, M. Lambert, Regulation of cell–cell junctions by the cytoskeleton, *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* 18 (2006) 541–548.
- [2] M. Perez-Moreno, C. Jamora, E. Fuchs, Sticky business: orchestrating cellular signals at adherens junctions, *Cell* 112 (2003) 535–548.
- [3] A.S. Yap, E.M. Kovacs, Direct cadherin-activated cell signaling: a view from the plasma membrane, *J. Cell Biol.* 160 (2003) 11–16.
- [4] L. Zanetta, M. Corada, M. Grazia Lampugnani, A. Zanetti, F. Breviario, L. Moons, P. Carmeliet, M.S. Pepper, E. Dejana, Downregulation of vascular endothelial-cadherin expression is associated with an increase in vascular tumor growth and hemorrhagic complications, *Thromb. Haemost.* 93 (2005) 1041–1046.
- [5] K.S. Ko, C.A. McCulloch, Intercellular mechanotransduction: cellular circuits that coordinate tissue responses to mechanical loading, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 285 (2001) 1077–1083.
- [6] G.L. Radice, H. Rayburn, H. Matsunami, K.A. Knudsen, M. Takeichi, R.O. Hynes, Developmental defects in mouse embryos lacking N-cadherin, *Dev. Biol.* 181 (1997) 64–78.
- [7] V.M. Braga, A. Del Maschio, L. Machesky, E. Dejana, Regulation of cadherin function by Rho and Rac: modulation by junction maturation and cellular context, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 10 (1999) 9–22.
- [8] C. Furman, A.L. Sieminski, A.V. Kwiatkowski, D.A. Robinson, E. Vasile, R.T. Bronson, R. Fassler, F.B. Gertler, Ena/VASP is required for endothelial barrier function in vivo, *J. Cell Biol.* 179 (2007) 761–775.
- [9] C.S. Chen, J. Tan, J. Tien, Mechanotransduction at cell–matrix and cell–cell contacts, *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 6 (2004) 275–302.
- [10] M. Iurlaro, F. Demontis, M. Corada, L. Zanetta, C. Drake, M. Gariboldi, S. Peiro, A. Cano, P. Navarro, A. Cattelino, S. Tognin, P.C. Marchisio, E. Dejana, VE-cadherin expression and clustering maintain low levels of survivin in endothelial cells, *Am. J. Pathol.* 165 (2004) 181–189.
- [11] B.M. Gumbiner, Cell adhesion: the molecular basis of tissue architecture and morphogenesis, *Cell* 84 (1996) 345–357.
- [12] B. Wojciak-Stothard, S. Potempa, T. Eichholtz, A.J. Ridley, Rho and Rac but not Cdc42 regulate endothelial cell permeability, *J. Cell Sci.* 114 (2001) 1343–1355.
- [13] P.A. Vincent, K. Xiao, K.M. Buckley, A.P. Kowalczyk, VE-cadherin: adhesion at arm's length, *Am. J. Physiol. Cell Physiol.* 286 (2004) C987–C997.
- [14] M.M. Lotz, C.A. Burdsal, H.P. Erickson, D.R. McClay, Cell adhesion to fibronectin and tenascin: quantitative measurements of initial binding and subsequent strengthening response, *J. Cell Biol.* 109 (1989) 1795–1805.
- [15] N.D. Gallant, in: *Mechanical Engineering*, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, 2004.
- [16] Y.S. Chu, W.A. Thomas, O. Eder, F. Pincet, E. Perez, J.P. Thiery, S. Dufour, Force measurements in E-cadherin-mediated cell doublets reveal rapid adhesion strengthened by actin cytoskeleton remodeling through Rac and Cdc42, *J. Cell Biol.* 167 (2004) 1183–1194.
- [17] C.G. Galbraith, K.M. Yamada, M.P. Sheetz, The relationship between force and focal complex development, *J. Cell Biol.* 159 (2002) 695–705.
- [18] J.A. Scott, A.M. Shewan, N.R. den Elzen, J.J. Loureiro, F.B. Gertler, A.S. Yap, Ena/VASP proteins can regulate distinct modes of actin organization at cadherin-adhesive contacts, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 17 (2006) 1085–1095.
- [19] W. Baumgartner, G.J. Schutz, J. Wiegand, N. Golenhofen, D. Drenckhahn, Cadherin function probed by laser tweezer and single molecule fluorescence in vascular endothelial cells, *J. Cell Sci.* 116 (2003) 1001–1011.
- [20] P. Navarro, L. Caveda, F. Breviario, I. Mandoteanu, M.G. Lampugnani, E. Dejana, Catenin-dependent and -independent functions of vascular endothelial cadherin, *J. Biol. Chem.* 270 (1995) 30965–30972.
- [21] Y. Miyake, N. Inoue, K. Nishimura, N. Kinoshita, H. Hosoya, S. Yonemura, Actomyosin tension is required for correct recruitment of adherens junction components and zonula occludens formation, *Exp. Cell Res.* 312 (2006) 1637–1650.

- [22] D. Choquet, D.P. Felsenfeld, M.P. Sheetz, Extracellular matrix rigidity causes strengthening of integrin-cytoskeleton linkages, *Cell* 88 (1997) 39–48.
- [23] V. Vasioukhin, C. Bauer, M. Yin, E. Fuchs, Directed actin polymerization is the driving force for epithelial cell–cell adhesion, *Cell* 100 (2000) 209–219.
- [24] M. Krause, E.W. Dent, J.E. Bear, J.J. Loureiro, F.B. Gertler, Ena/VASP proteins: regulators of the actin cytoskeleton and cell migration, *Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol.* 19 (2003) 541–564.
- [25] J.E. Bear, T.M. Svitkina, M. Krause, D.A. Schafer, J.J. Loureiro, G.A. Strasser, I.V. Maly, O.Y. Chaga, J.A. Cooper, G.G. Borisy, F.B. Gertler, Antagonism between Ena/VASP proteins and actin filament capping regulates fibroblast motility, *Cell* 109 (2002) 509–521.
- [26] W. Baumgartner, N. Golenhofen, N. Grundhofer, J. Wiegand, D. Drenckhahn,  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  dependency of N-cadherin function probed by laser tweezer and atomic force microscopy, *J. Neurosci.* 23 (2003) 11008–11014.
- [27] J. Lammerding, in: *Biological Engineering Division*, MIT, Cambridge, 2004.
- [28] J. Chen, B. Fabry, E.L. Schiffrin, N. Wang, Twisting integrin receptors increases endothelin-1 gene expression in endothelial cells, *Am. J. Physiol. Cell Physiol.* 280 (2001) C1475–C1484.
- [29] H. Huang, J. Sylvan, M. Jonas, R. Barresi, P.T. So, K.P. Campbell, R.T. Lee, Cell stiffness and receptors: evidence for cytoskeletal subnetworks, *Am. J. Physiol. Cell Physiol.* 288 (2005) C72–C80.
- [30] A. Ganz, M. Lambert, A. Saez, P. Silberzan, A. Buguin, R.M. Mege, B. Ladoux, Traction forces exerted through N-cadherin contacts, *Biol. Cell* 98 (2006) 721–730.
- [31] L. Dertsiz, G. Ozbilim, Y. Kayisli, G.A. Gokhan, A. Demircan, U.A. Kayisli, Differential expression of VASP in normal lung tissue and lung adenocarcinomas, *Thorax* 60 (2005) 576–581.