Dr. David Monk

Hosted By: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services National Institutes of Health

Maternal uniparental disomy 7, Silver-Russell syndrome and imprinted candidate genes

Dr David Monk IRDB Imperial College London





An average day in U.S: 11,120 babies born



An average day in U.S: 11,120 babies born 1,280 babies born preterm



An average day in U.S:

11,120 babies born
1,280 babies born preterm
841 babies born with low birth weight (> 2.5 kg)
159 babies born with very low birth weight (>1.5 kg)

From www.marchofdimes.com/peristats

Babies born with IUGR may have immediate problems such as:

Asphyxia Hypoglycemia Hypothermia Neonatal jaundice Neurological delay

And later in life.....

Increased risk of heart disease Hypertension Diabetes

Fetal growth is a complex process influenced by maternal, placental and fetal factors

Fetal growth is a complex process influenced by maternal, placental and fetal factors

The aetiology of IUGR is multifactorial, involving both genetic and environmental factors

Fetal growth is a complex dynamic process influenced by maternal, placental and fetal factors

The aetiology of IUGR is multifactorial, involving both genetic and environmental factors

Common causes of IUGR are congenital abnormalities; inadequate maternal-fetal circulation; and an idiopathic group

Within the idiopathic group will be a subset of babies which have genetic factors, such as aberrant genomic imprinting

A genetic model for IUGR:

Silver-Russell syndrome

A genetic model for IUGR:

Silver-Russell syndrome

IUGR Postnatal growth restriction

Therefore and excellent model for investigating the molecular mechanisms underlying fetal growth restriction

Silver-Russell Syndrome

Main clinical features for diagnosis:Intrauterine growth restriction (IUGR) (<2 SD below mean)

- Short stature (<2 SD below mean)
- Characteristic face
- Asymmetry
- Fifth finger clinodactyly
- + other confirmatory features



Price et al., 1999



Genetically heterogeneous; no clearly established Mendelian inheritance pattern. However, several pedigrees show skewed penetrance towards female transmission (Duncan et al., 1990)

Structural chromosomal abnormalities; disruptions provide clues to location of genes involved in SRS by aiding positional cloning approach

Human chromosome 7 and genomic imprinting

mUPD7 in 7-10% of SRS cases (Kotzot et al., 1995; Preece et al., 1997; Eggermann et al., 1997)

Both hetero- and isodisomic cases reported

Mixed iso-heterodisomy observed with no common isodisomic interval in five patients. This indicates that an imprinting effect opposed to unmasking of mutant recessive allele cause the phenotype (Preece et al., 1999)

Lack of paternal expression could be associated with the SRS phenotype, as could the maternal duplication of a gene involved in growth inhibition

mUPD7



Normal

Heterodisomy

Isodisomy

F= father P= proband M= mother

Chromosome 7	Marker	Location (cM)	Maximum	1	2	3	4	5
\frown	D701404	2.2	neterozygosity					
	D/S1484	5.5	0.88					
	D7521	3.1	0.99				—	
	D78331	/.0	0.77	—			—	
	D7S2201	12.7	0.62			—	—	
	D75313	21.4	0.82			—	—	
	D75493	37.9	0.89			—		
	D751802	38.1 45.0	0.75					
	D751000	43.9	0.78				T	
	D75494	50.2	0.78			T	I	
	D752846	59.2 62.2	0.75					
	- D7S519	72.0	0.70					
	D7S1818	72.0	0.82					
	D751818	72.0	0.76					
	D7S494	76.6	0.70					
	D78473	70.0	0.79					
	D7S639	82.0	0.74		-			
	D78672	86.2	0.83					
	D78669	93.9	0.80					
	D7S2204	94.6	0.80					•
	D7S2204	99.5	0.74					
	D78524	103.6	0.75					
	D7S820	104.0	0.83					
	- D78527	115.7	0.76	•				
	D7S821	116.0	0.83					
	D7S1799	121.1	0.72					
	/ D7S486	130.8	0.81				•	
	CFTR	131.0	0.89					
	D7S2847	131.4	0.86					
	D7S530	138.3	0.79					
	D7S1804	139.0	0.86					
	D7S684	154.9	0.81	•				
	D7S1824	157.3	0.82					
	D7S2195	159.8	0.79			-		
	• D7S1805	166.8	0.77			•		
	D7S1826	167.2	0.76			•	<u> </u>	
	• D7S483	168.6	0.83			<u> </u>		
	D7S559	185.5	0.83	—				
	D7S22	192.6	0.97	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		
\cup $ $	D7S550	194.0	0.81					

Preece et al., 1999

A milder mUPD7 SRS phenotype?

Careful dissection of the SRS phenotype suggests that some mUPD7 cases have a milder phenotypes (Price et al., 1999; Kotzot et al., 2000; Hannula et al., 2000)

A milder mUPD7 SRS phenotype?

Careful dissection of the SRS phenotype suggests that some mUPD7 cases have a milder phenotypes (Price et al., 1999; Kotzot et al., 2000; Hannula et al., 2000)

mUPD7 patients consistently lack classic feature: Triangular face Digit abnormalities- clinodactyly - brachydactyly - syndactyly Down turned corners to the mouth

Characteristic	Hannula mUPD7 (4)	Reported mUPD7 (20)	Non-mUPD7
IUGR	100	58	79
Growth restriction	100	100	99
(> -2.5 SD)			
Asymmetry	100	37.4	39.8
Relative macrocephaly	100	70.7	76
Motor developmental delay	50	20.8	34
Speech delay	100	24.9	21
Excessive sweating	100	24.9	36
Feeding difficulties	100	33	46
Triangular face	0	29	86
Down turned corners of mouth	0	0	60
Clinodactyly	50	37	76

Characteristic	Hannula mUPD7 (4)	Reported mUPD7 (20)	Non-mUPD7
IUGR	100	58	79
Growth restriction	100	100	99
(> -2.5 SD)			
Asymmetry	100	37.4	39.8
Relative macrocephaly	100	70.7	76
Motor developmental delay	50	20.8	34
Speech delay	100	24.9	21
Excessive sweating	100	24.9	36
Feeding difficulties	100	33	46
Triangular face	0	29	86
Down turned corners of mouth	0	0	60
Clinodactyly	50	37	76

Characteristic	Hannula mUPD7 (4)	Reported mUPD7 (20)	Non-mUPD7
IUGR	100	58	79
Growth restriction	100	100	99
(> -2.5 SD)			
Asymmetry	100	37.4	39.8
Relative macrocephaly	100	70.7	76
Motor developmental delay	50	20.8	34
Speech delay	100	24.9	21
Excessive sweating	100	24.9	36
Feeding difficulties	100	33	46
Triangular face	0	29	86
Down turned corners of mouth	0	0	60
Clinodactyly	50	37	76

Mosaicism in SRS?

Evidence of mosaicism in BWS

Example of over-exposed Southern blot showing low level mosaicism in a BWS patient with hemihypertrophy



HBBP/*Hinc*II

No evidence for mosaicism in SRS



Non mUPD7 SRS with asymmetry

mUPD7 (hetero) with asymmetry

mUPD7 (hetero) without asymmetry

Chromosome 7 rearrangements defining imprinted critical regions

The 7p candidate region:

Maternal inherited duplications of 7p11.2-p13, encompassing the *GRB10* gene (Joyce et al., 1999; Monk et al., 2000)

SRS and SRS-like patients with inversion and translocation breakpoints within 7p11.2 (Monk et al., 2002)

Chromosome 7 rearrangements defining imprinted critical regions

The 7p candidate region:

Maternal inherited duplications of 7p11.2-p13, encompassing the *GRB10* gene (Joyce et al., 1999; Monk et al., 2000)

SRS and SRS-like patients with inversion and translocation breakpoints within 7p11.2 (Monk et al., 2002)

The 7q candidate region:

Segmental mUPD of 7q31-qter in a single case of SRS (Hannula et al., 2001)

Chromosome 7 rearrangements defining imprinted critical regions

The 7p candidate region:

Maternal inherited duplications of 7p11.2-p13, encompassing the *GRB10* gene (Joyce et al., 1999; Monk et al., 2000)

SRS and SRS-like patients with inversion and translocation breakpoints within 7p11.2 (Monk et al., 2002)

The 7q candidate region:

Segmental mUPD of 7q31-qter in a single case of SRS (Hannula et al., 2001)

Two unrelated cases of mUPD7q and pUPD7p resulting from T(7)(q;q)(p;p) (Eggerding et al., 1994; Kotzot et al., 2001)

Human-mouse homology map



Integrated physical and transcript map of the 7p11.1-p14 critical region





Imprinting of *GRB10* and *GRB10*β in human fetal tissues



Imprinting analysis using monochromosomal somatic cell hybrids

(A) Hybrids genotyped to ensure identification of cells containing a single paternal or maternal homologues

(B) Maintained imprinting of the *PEG1/MEST* gene isoforms in hybrid cell lines

(C) Biallelic expression of HUS1



The search for additional imprinted genes at 7p11.2-12 and proximal mouse Chr 11

Schematic representation of the Me-RDA technique



Schematic representation of the Me-RDA technique



Clone and analysis



Methylation profiles for the 5' mouse Grb10 CpG islands



Methylation profiles for the 5' human GRB10 CpG islands



Methylation profiles for the 5' human GRB10 CpG islands



Meg1/Grb10 imprinted regulation- Insulator boundary model



Meg1/Grb10 imprinted regulation- Insulator boundary model



Human GRB10 regulation



Mutations in the *GRB10* genes in SRS?

No coding mutations found in 139 patients (Mergenthaler et al., 2000; Yoshihashi et al., 2000; Hitchins et al., 2001)

Mutations in the *GRB10* genes in SRS?

No coding mutations found in 139 patients (Mergenthaler et al., 2000; Yoshihashi et al., 2000; Hitchins et al., 2001)

GRB10 CpG2 DMR epimutation in SRS?



No epigenetic mutations in 46 SRS patients (Arnaud et al., 2003)

The 7q32 candidate gene region



Hannula et al., 2001

Candidate imprinted genes within 7q32

MEST: Imprinted, paternally expressed
 Within the region of segmental mUPD7
 Within the mouse region showing a growth restricted phenotype
 Mest knock-out mice are growth restricted
 No coding or epigenetic mutations in 50+ patients

Candidate imprinted genes within 7q32

MEST: Imprinted, paternally expressed
 Within the region of segmental mUPD7
 Within the mouse region showing a growth restricted phenotype
 Mest knock-out mice are growth restricted
 No coding or epigenetic mutations in 50+ patients

γ-2-COP: Imprinted status disputed, reports of paternal expression (Blagitko et al., 1999; Yamasaki et al., 2000)

MESTIT1: Anti-sense for MEST, paternally expressed (Nakabayashi et al., 2002)

CPA4: Tissue-specific maternal expression (Bentley et al., 2003; Kayashima et al., 2003)No coding mutations in 20 patients

Conclusions

- 10% of SRS cases present with mUPD7
- There are two imprinted candidate gene regions for SRS on human chromosome 7, 7p11.2-p13 and 7q31-qter, which have homology to imprinted mouse regions
- The phenotypes observed for the patients with 7p duplication may result from either over-expression of the maternal *GRB10* isoforms, or from an extra copy of this region
- A definite role for imprinting has been indicated for 7q31-qter due reports of a single SRS patient with segmental mUPD for this region
- No mutations have been found in any imprinted candidate gene



IRBD, Imperial College London Prof. Gudrun Moore Dr Phil Stanier Prof. Michael Preece Louise Bentley

MRC Harwell Dr Jo Peters Colin Beechey



The Babraham Institute Dr Gavin Kelsey Dr Philippe Arnaud Dr Rachel Smith



The Silver-Russell syndrome consortium

Steve Scherer - Toronto, Canada Juha Kere- Helsinki, Finland

Thomas Eggermann- Aachen, Germany