

# NIH Public Access

**Author Manuscript** 

Gastroenterology. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2011 August 1.

# Published in final edited form as:

Gastroenterology. 2010 August ; 139(2): 439-447.e1. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2010.04.047.

# ALLELE-SPECIFIC EXPRESSION OF *APC* IN ADENOMATOUS POLYPOSIS FAMILIES

# Ester Castellsagué,

Translational Research Laboratory, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona 08907, Spain.

# Sara González,

Translational Research Laboratory, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona 08907, Spain

# Elisabet Guinó,

Bioinformatics and Biostatistics Unit, Department of Epidemiology, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona 08907, Spain

# Kristen N. Stevens,

Department of Epidemiology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI 48109, Michigan, USA

# Ester Borràs,

Translational Research Laboratory, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona 08907, Spain

# Victoria M. Raymond,

Department of Internal Medicine, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor MI 48109, Michigan, USA

# Conxi Lázaro,

Translational Research Laboratory, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona 08907, Spain

# Ignacio Blanco,

Cancer Genetic Counseling Program, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona, Spain

# Stephen B. Gruber, and

Department of Internal Medicine, Epidemiology, and Human Genetics, Division of Molecular Medicine and Genetics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI 48109, Michigan, USA

# Gabriel Capellá

Disclosures: No conflicts of interest exist.

<sup>© 2010</sup> The American Gastroenterological Association. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

**Correspondence:** Gabriel Capellá Translational Research Laboratory, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona 08907, Spain. gcapella@iconcologia.net Tel +34 93-260-7461 Fax +34 93-260-7466.

**Contribution to the manuscript:** - **Ester Castellsagué**: Study concept and design; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; technical or material support; drafting of the manuscript.

<sup>-</sup> Sara González: Study concept and design; acquisition of data; study supervision.

<sup>-</sup> Elisabet Guinó: Statistical analysis.

<sup>-</sup> Kristen N. Stevens: Technical or material support; acquisition of data.

<sup>-</sup> Ester Borràs: Technical or material support; acquisition of data.

<sup>-</sup> Victoria M. Raymond: Technical or material support; acquisition of data.

<sup>-</sup> Conxi Lázaro: Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

<sup>-</sup> Ignacio Blanco: Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; acquisition of data.

<sup>-</sup> Stephen B. Gruber: Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; acquisition of data.

<sup>-</sup> Gabriel Capellá: Study concept and design; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; obtained funding; study supervision.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Translational Research Laboratory, IDIBELL-Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona 08907, Spain.

# Abstract

**Backgound & Aims**—Germline mutations of the *APC* gene are the pathogenic cause of most cases of familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) and a lesser proportion of attenuated FAP (AFAP). Systematic analysis of *APC* at the RNA level may provide insight into the pathogenicity of identified mutations and uncover the molecular basis of FAP/AFAP in families without identifiable mutations. Here, we analyzed the prevalence of imbalances in the allelic expression of *APC* in polyposis families with germline mutations in the gene and without detectable mutations in *APC* or and *MUTYH*.

**Methods**—Allele-specific expression (ASE) was determined by single nucleotide primer extension using an exon 11 polymorphism as an allele-specific marker. In total, 52 *APC*-mutation-positive (36 families) and 24 *APC/MUTYH*-mutation-negative (23 families) informative patients were analyzed. Seventy-six controls were also included.

**Results**—Of the *APC*-mutation-positive families, most of those in which the mutation was located before the last exon of the gene (12 of 14) showed ASE imbalance, which is consistent with a mechanism of nonsense-mediated decay (NMD). Of the *APC/MUTYH* mutation-negative families, two (9%) showed ASE imbalance as a hallmark of the putative pathogenic cause of the disease. Normal allele expression was restored after treatment of short-term cultured lymphocytes with puromycin, supporting the NMD hypothesis.

**Conclusions**—ASE analysis may be an indicator of pathogenicity for some cases of FAP and AFAP in which *APC* mutations are not found. ASE might also be useful for prioritizing the order in which different areas of *APC* should be tested. Our results underline the importance of RNA-level studies in molecular diagnosis of FAP.

#### Keywords

Familial adenomatous polyposis; Allele-specific expression; APC; Nonsense-mediated decay

# **BACKGROUND & AIMS**

Familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP), an autosomal dominant disease predisposing to colorectal cancer, is mainly caused by truncating germline mutations in the *APC* gene  $(5q21-22)^1$ . Widespread use of sequencing techniques has led to the identification of an increased number of missense mutations<sup>2</sup>, variants with a putative impact on mRNA splicing<sup>3</sup>, and cases of somatic and germline mosaicisms<sup>4</sup>. Exon dose analysis has detected gross rearrangements in a minority of cases<sup>5</sup>. Although in a lesser proportion of cases, attenuated FAP (AFAP) is also associated with *APC* mutations and with biallelic germline mutations in the *MUTYH* gene, showing an autosomal recessive pattern<sup>6</sup>.

In other cancer predisposition genes such as *MSH2*, *MLH1*, *BRCA1*, *BRCA2* and *NF1*, studies at the RNA level have shown that mutations causing a premature termination codon (PTC) usually trigger nonsense-mediated decay (NMD) of the mRNA<sup>7-11</sup>. This mRNA surveillance mechanism reduces the abundance of premature stop-codon-harboring mRNA and of the corresponding truncated proteins. NMD of the affected transcript occurs if the PTC is located approximately 55 bp upstream of the last intron-exon boundary<sup>12</sup>. Although some RNA studies of the *APC* gene have been published, focused mainly on the presence of aberrant splicing due to missense, silent or unclassified variants<sup>3,13</sup>, to date there are no published studies offering a systematic analysis of the impact of pathogenic *APC* mutations at the RNA level.

The proportion of familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) families with identifiable *APC* mutations has shown a slight increase with the incorporation of new techniques into diagnostic algorithms. However, a large subset has undetectable pathogenic changes [designated here as APC(-)/MUTYH(-)]. Small decreases in *APC* mRNA have been detected in  $APC(-)^{14,15}$  and APC(-)/MUTYH(-) families<sup>16-18</sup>. In contrast, high germline levels of an *APC* mRNA isoform resulting from an exon 10-15 connection have been observed in a case of APC(-)/MUTYH(-) AFAP<sup>19</sup>. Germline imbalances in allele-specific expression (ASE) of the *APC* gene have been detected in FAP and AFAP families<sup>14, 15, 18, 20</sup>, but their potential contribution to diagnostic yield is unknown.

The prevalence of imbalances in *APC* allelic expression was analyzed in two sets of polyposis families: *APC* mutation-positive [designated here as *APC*(+)] and *APC*(-)/MUTYH(-). Here we show that mutations outside exon 15 are associated with a clear allelic imbalance at the RNA level that is secondary to NMD, and that these imbalances are also detected in a low proportion of *APC*(-)/MUTYH(-) families.

# PATIENTS AND METHODS

#### Patients

One hundred and twenty-seven FAP and AFAP families from the Catalan Institute of Oncology (ICO) and the University of Michigan (UM) were initially tested for germline *APC* and *MUTYH* mutations by comprehensive diagnostic methods (sequencing or SSCP analysis of all exons and exon-intron boundaries, gross deletion analysis by QMPSF (Quantitative Multiplex PCR of Short Fluorescent Fragments) and/or MLPA (Multiplex Ligation-dependent Probe Amplification) and/or Southern blot for the *APC* gene, presence of germline epimutations in *APC* promoter in conjunction with sequencing of the two most prevalent variants of the *MUTYH* gene – Y165C and G382D). Mutations were found in 76 families, while the molecular pathogenic cause of the disease remained unknown in 51 families. The mutation detection rates were 83% for FAP and 25% for AFAP.

Individuals from 59 of the families tested heterozygous for the rs2229992 *APC* coding SNP in exon 11 of the *APC* gene and were the informative population of the present study. These families were divided according to mutational status: (i) 36 APC(+) families (24 classical FAP, 34 carrier individuals; 12 AFAP, 18 carrier individuals); and (ii) 23 APC(-)/MUTYH(-) families (5 FAP, 6 individuals; 18 AFAP, 18 individuals).

A total of 76 heterozygous controls were included: 29 non-carriers from *APC* mutation families, 6 carriers and 24 non-carriers from *MSH2* and *MLH1* mutation families, and 17 Ashkenazi Jewish individuals diagnosed with sporadic microsatellite-unstable colorectal cancer that form part of the Molecular Epidemiology of Colorectal Cancer (MECC) study. This is a population-based case-control study of incident colorectal cancer (CRC), including histopathologically confirmed cases from all incident colorectal cancer cases diagnosed in northern Israel from 31 March 1998 onwards. Informed consent was obtained from all of the subjects who participated in the study.

#### Genotyping: SNaPshot analysis of genomic DNA

Peripheral blood lymphocyte DNA was obtained using the FlexiGene DNA kit (Qiagen). Twenty-five ng of genomic DNA were amplified in a final volume of 25  $\mu$ L containing 0.13  $\mu$ mol/L primers, 0.2 mmol/L dNTPs, 2.5 mmol/L MgCl<sub>2</sub> and 1.25 U *Taq* polymerase (Thermoprime Plus DNA Polymerase; ABgene). After an initial denaturing step, samples underwent 5 initial cycles (1 min at 94°C, 30 s at 65°C, 30 s at 72°C), 20 cycles (1 min at 94°C, 30 s at 55°C, 30 s at 72°C), and 10 final cycles (1 min at 94°C, 30 s at 55°C, 30 s at 72°C). Primers in exon 11 (Forward: 5'-

#### GGGACTACAGGCCATTGCA-3' and reverse: 5'-

CAAGTTTGTCAAAGCCATTCCAGC-3') were used to amplify the rs2229992 SNP. To remove unincorporated primers and dNTPs, PCR fragments were purified using illustra<sup>TM</sup> GFX<sup>TM</sup> PCR DNA and Gel Band Purification Kit (GE Healthcare). For the single nucleotide primer extension reaction, primer extension was carried out with the SNaPshot Multiplex Kit (Applied Biosystems) with 5'-ATTGCAAGTGGACTGTGAAATGTA-3' according to manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, reactions were performed in a total volume of 10  $\mu$ L containing 1.5  $\mu$ L treated PCR product, 4.5  $\mu$ L SNaPshot Ready Reaction Mix and 0.2  $\mu$ mol/L extension primer. Primer extension thermocycling conditions consisted of 25 cycles of 96°C for 10 s, 50°C for 5 s, and 60°C for 30 s. SNaPshot reaction products were treated with 1 U shrimp alkaline phosphatase (usb) for 60 min at 37°C and then 15 min at 75°C. Products were run in an ABI Prism 3130 DNA sequencer and analyzed by GeneMapper v4.0 (Applied Biosystems). Heterozygous samples showed a profile with two peaks (black and red peaks represent C and T alleles, respectively), while only one peak was observed for homozygous samples.

#### Measuring ASE: SNaPshot analysis of cDNA

Total RNA was isolated from frozen lymphocytes using Trizol Reagent (Invitrogen) according to manufacturer's instructions. Two hundred and fifty ng of RNA were reverse-transcribed into cDNA using pdN<sub>6</sub> primers and MMLV reverse transcriptase (Invitrogen). To specifically amplify rs2229992 SNP in cDNA, we used the same exon 11 forward primer as for DNA amplification and a reverse primer targeting the exon 11-12 junction (5'-ATAGAGCATAGCGTAGCCTTGTTG -3'). PCR reactions were performed in a final volume of 25  $\mu$ L containing 2  $\mu$ L of cDNA, 0.2  $\mu$ mol/L primers, 0.2 mmol/L dNTPs, 2.5 mmol/L MgCl<sub>2</sub> and 1.25 U *Taq* polymerase (Thermoprime Plus DNA Polymerase; ABgene). After a denaturing step, 35 cycles of 30 s at 94°C, 30 s at 55°C, and 30 s at 72°C were performed. The remaining steps were the same as described for genotyping, including purification, SNaPshot reaction, phosphatase treatment and capillary electrophoresis.

ASE was measured using peak intensities in heterozygous samples. Allelic frequencies were calculated as freq. C = C/(C+kT) or freq. T = T/(T+k'C), where *k* and *k'* are constants given by the mean of C/T (*k*) and T/C (*k'*) proportions in control samples. These constants were used to correct for unequal representation of alleles in known control heterozygotes, caused by differential PCR amplification of alleles, differential efficiencies of ddNTP incorporation in the extension reaction, unequal emission energies of fluorescent dyes<sup>21</sup>, or putative differences in physiological RNA levels due to alternative splicing affecting exons 1, 7, 9, 10A and 14 of the *APC* gene<sup>22-27</sup>. ASE values are expressed as the proportion of frequencies of the two alleles (freq. C:freq. T). Three independent replicates of all experiments were obtained, and a set of controls was included in every experiment. A Mann-Whitney test was used to evaluate ASE differences among groups.

To validate the SNaPshot analysis as a quantitative technique, two homozygous samples representing the two alleles were selected. After reverse transcription, cDNAs were mixed in different proportions (0:10, 1:9, 2:8, 3:7, 4:6, 5:5, 6:4, 7:3, 8:2, 9:1 and 10:0) and analyzed in triplicate. As seen in Figure 1, SNaPshot assay of rs2229992 SNP provides a quantitative measurement of ASE of the *APC* gene with an analytical sensitivity of at least 10% (Figure 1). To set the cut-off points for equal and unequal expression we used 14 controls from the ICO subset of samples and obtained a mean value of  $1.002\pm0.055$  (Figure 2, A). From these results we established a conservative range for normal ASE values of 0.836-1.168 with a confidence of 99% (mean values  $\pm 3 \cdot$ SD). These values were independently validated in an additional set of 14 controls with a range for normal values of 0.732-1.198 (mean values  $\pm 3 \cdot$ SD), which has been consistently replicated in independent experiments using different control sets. In the presence of modest inter-experiment variability, a set of control samples

was always run in the same experiment. Pyrosequencing was used to confirm the range of normal ASE values in an independent set of 18 controls. Briefly, germline cDNA and germline DNA were PCR-amplified using the forward primer (GAATTATTGCAAGTGGACTGTGAA) and the reverse biotinylated primer (GCCATTCCAGCATATCGTCTTA) to yield an 83 base-pair amplicon containing rs2229992. The PCR reaction mixture  $(25\mu L)$  contained 5ng of genomic DNA or  $1\mu L$  of cDNA,  $2.5\mu$ l of 10X PCR buffer (Applied Biosystems),  $2\mu L$  of 25mM MgCl2 (Applied Biosystems),  $1.25\mu L$  of 2.5mM dNTP (New England Biolabs),  $0.5\mu L$  of each  $10\mu M$  primer, and 0.75 U of AmpliTaq Gold DNA polymerase (Applied Biosystems). Cycling conditions were as follows: initial denaturation at 95°C for 3 min, 50 cycles of 95°C for 34 sec, 60°C for 45 sec, 72°C for 45 sec, and a final extension at 72°C for 10 min.  $5\mu L$  of the resulting PCR product was used for pyrosequencing with the sequencing primer (GCAAGTGGACTGTGAAAT) according to the standard Qiagen protocol. Normal ASE values were similar using this technique, ranging from 0.732 to 1.198 (mean values  $\pm 3 \cdot SD$ ).

#### **Puromycin analysis**

Frozen lymphocytes from a subset of patients and controls were short-cultured in RPMI 1640 + GlutaMAX medium (10% FBS, 1% penicillin-streptomycin) (Gibco) and phytohemagglutinin (Sigma). After 6-9 days, two subcultures were derived: one was treated with 250 µg/mL puromycin (Sigma) for 5 hours, while the other was left untreated. RNA was extracted and ASE calculated as described above.

#### APC cDNA molecular analysis and promoter analyses

*APC* cDNA molecular analysis was performed in all APC(-)/MUTYH(-) families showing ASE imbalance. Six overlapping primer pairs covering all exon-exon boundaries of the *APC* gene were designed to test for abnormal cDNA products in these families. Differential running patterns between test samples and controls were assessed visually using agarose gel electrophoresis and observed abnormal bands were sequenced. Sequencing of the 1A and 1B promoter regions of the *APC* gene was also performed. Finally, *APC* gene expression levels were analyzed in all ICO samples by qRT-PCR using a primer pair targeting exons 2 and 3. The primer sequences and experimental conditions for these analyses are detailed in Supplementary Table 1.

# RESULTS

#### ASE analysis in APC(+) polyposis families

ASE was assessed in 52 individuals (34 FAP and 18 AFAP) APC(+) from 36 families (24 FAP and 12 AFAP) that tested heterozygous at rs2229992, in parallel with non-carrier individuals and controls. To categorize ASE, a cut-off range was calculated as described in Patients and Methods. ASE values <0.836 designated C-allele underexpression and values >1.168 designated C-allele overexpression, in both cases depicting allelic imbalance. The average and standard deviation (SD) ASE values for non-carriers (n=24) were 0.964±0.038 (Figure 2, A), with none outside the normal range. Twenty-two families (24 individuals) showed normal ASE values (range=0.876-1.155). The remaining 14 (39%) showed ASE imbalances: five families (8 individuals) showed C-allele overexpression (range=1.214-8.706), eight families (18 individuals) showed C-allele underexpression (range=0.677-0.830), and one family showed the borderline value of 0.838. Another family, harboring a deletion from the promoter to exon 4, showed complete loss of T-allele expression (F-UM-8) and was used as an internal control (Figure 2, A; Table 1).

In accordance with the canonical model of NMD, a strong correlation was observed between the location of the mutation outside exon 15 (leading to a premature termination codon

before the last exon of the gene) and the presence of ASE imbalance. Twelve of 14 (86%) families with mutations outside exon 15 showed abnormal ASE, whereas the proportion dropped to 2 of 22 (9%) for families with exon 15 mutations (p-value=7.3e-13, obtained from ASE values) (Table 1; Figure 2, B). Interestingly, the 4 cases that did not fit with the model showed borderline ASE values. Thus, the ASE values for the two families with mutations outside exon 15 and with no imbalance (F-UM-2 and F-UM-9) were 1.155 and 1.133 (upper cut-off value 1.168). The two cases with exon 15 mutations and classified as harboring putative imbalances (F-8 and F-9) showed ASE values of 0.830 and 0.838 (lower cut-off value 0.836). F-8 harbors a mutation at intron 14 that is predicted to alter intron-exon processing, leading to a truncated protein at exon 15. F-9 has a recurrent mutation, p.Gln1062X, that was not associated with ASE in other cases in our series sharing the same alteration (F-13 and F-22). However, F-9 was classified as putatively abnormal because the imbalance essentially coincided with the diagnostic threshold value and was confirmed in cultured lymphocytes (Table 1).

Variations in ASE imbalance depending on the location of the mutation associate with different *APC* expression levels. Values of *APC* germ-line expression in 43 controls were  $3.793\pm2.933$ . Expression levels in polyposis with exon 15 mutations were similar ( $3.647\pm0.911$ ), while expression levels in polyposis with mutations outside exon 15 were lower ( $2.887\pm0.867$ ; p=0.014).

More than one member (range=2-5) was analyzed in 8 FAP and AFAP families, and all carriers showed concordant ASE values in 7 of these families (Table 1). In one family (F-2), two of the three carriers analyzed showed abnormal ASE values (0.823 and 0.717) and the third carrier showed a normal borderline value (0.853), which probably reflects a degree of variability between individuals. ASE values were similar among families with the same mutation. For example, in families F-4 (FAP) and F-23 (AFAP), carriers of the same splicing mutation (c.834+1G>A), ASE values were similar, although they did not account for phenotype differences. Allelic imbalance cosegregated with the disease in all cases analyzed (data not shown).

In nine of the allelic imbalance cases, short-term lymphocyte cultures showed clearer ASE imbalance than observed in cDNA from peripheral blood lymphocytes. Puromycin treatment completely reverted imbalance in 8 of the 9 cases. In the remaining case, only partial reversion was achieved (Table 1). Cultured control lymphocytes showed normal ASE values that remained unchanged after puromycin treatment (data not shown).

#### ASE analysis in APC(-)/MUTYH(-) polyposis families

Twenty-three (5 FAP and 18 AFAP) APC(-)/MUTYH(-) families (6 and 18 individuals, respectively) were heterozygous for the SNP at exon 11 and were subsequently analyzed. Mean ASE values in controls were 1.001±0.047. Initially, three of the 23 families showed abnormal *APC* ASE values (F-29, F-39 and UM-11) (Figure 3 and Table 2). Puromycin treatment of short-term cultured lymphocytes was performed in the two families from whom lymphocytes were available (F-29 and F-39) (Table 2). In family F-29, the observed imbalance was more intense in cultured cells than in PBL and was completely reverted by puromycin treatment, as expected. In F-39, with an ASE value of 0.819, the imbalance was no longer observed in cultured lymphocytes. Thus, two of the 23 (9%) APC(-)/MUTYH(-) families in our series (F-29 and UM-11) harbored ASE imbalance. In F-29, two point mutations in the promoter region were identified: g.[112043282C>G(+) 112072889C>T]. These changes were not detected in a small set of 9 controls. However, they were not located in a conserved sequence or a sequence consensus region for transcription factors, and were not associated with clear changes in *APC* expression levels as assessed by qRT-PCR. At the RNA level, the wt transcript coexisted with a second transcript containing a 60

bp insertion r.[=, 1408\_1409ins1408+1315\_1408+1369] in UM-11 RNA. These transcripts were also present in three of five additional samples consisting of either controls or FAP patients with no ASE imbalance. Interestingly, UM-11 family did not express a transcript skipping exon 11 that was present in other samples (data not shown). Finally, germline *APC* expression levels were lower in APC(-)/MUTYH(-) polyposis families (2.963±1.21) than in controls (p=0.04) or and APC(+) polyposis families with exon 15 mutations (p=0.01).

# DISCUSSION

In this study we adapted the SNuPE (single nucleotide primer extension) methodology to perform a detailed allele-specific expression analysis of the *APC* gene in 59 FAP and AFAP families divided in two groups: those harboring a pathogenic mutation and those with no identified *APC* or *MUTYH* mutation.

In the presence of a detectable deleterious *APC* gene mutation, ASE imbalance was strongly associated with mutations located outside exon 15. Conversely, balanced ASE was common in cases with exon 15 mutations. Both observations fit, albeit imperfectly, with the nuclear scanning model of NMD in mammals<sup>10,12</sup>. Our observations are in disagreement with the findings of Renkonen and colleagues, who reported no ASE imbalance in a small series of 4 families harboring mutations in exons 6-9 of the *APC* gene, possibly due to differences in technique or sample processing<sup>20</sup>. To assess the contribution of NMD to the observed imbalance, lymphocytes were short-term cultured and treated with puromycin, a known inhibitor of NMD<sup>28</sup>. Similarly to previous observations, enhanced allelic expression imbalance was observed *in vitro* before puromycin treatment, pointing to higher degradation of nonsense transcripts associated with culture conditions<sup>29</sup>. Puromycin treatment (F-24, I-106), and it is unclear whether this can be attributed to the intensity of allelic imbalance, the limitations of the *in vitro* assay or other unknown causes.

As has been reported for *MSH2*, *MLH1*, *BRCA1-2* and *NF1*<sup>7-11</sup>, the nuclear scanning NMD model loosely fits with our observations for the *APC* gene. One of the exceptions is a mutation at intron 14 that creates a skipping of exon 14 and a PTC at the very beginning of exon 15 (data not shown) that associates with imbalanced ASE. This may be due to the special position of the PTC and its sequence context, both of which are factors known to influence the extent of NMD.

NMD can be considered a modifier of the phenotypic consequences of PTC and has contributed to our understanding of genotype-phenotype correlations in various genetic disorders<sup>30</sup>. In mutations outside exon 15, NMD may promote partial loss-of-function or haploinsufficiency. Of note, family 24, harboring a frameshift mutation at exon 12, showed the highest ASE imbalance and an attenuated phenotype. It can be speculated that, in this case, the mutant allele is degraded leading to a bigger proportion of wt APC homodimers and a milder phenotype. In mutations causing PTCs in exon 15, absence of NMD activity may enhance the dominant-negative effect. As such, it is notable that our preliminary observations indicate lower germline *APC* expression levels in polyposis with mutations outside exon 15. An exon-15-mutated allele is not amenable for degradation by NMD, so this mechanism cannot act as an additional regulatory mechanism. However, no clear phenotypic correlation between clinical features and location of the mutation was observed in our series.

Finally, imbalanced ASE was observed in the absence of a detectable mutation in a subset of APC(-)/MUTYH(-) families assessed by conventional methods. A more detailed analysis of

cDNA and promoter regions revealed the presence of alterations in *APC* promoter that may be functionally relevant in one family, while in the other family a complex pattern of *APC* transcripts in the exon 11 region was of unknown significance. We cannot rule out the possibility that a genetic change deep within an intron may account for the observed ASE imbalance. In addition, *cis*-acting regulatory SNPs with an allele-specific effect on *APC* might also be responsible for the imbalance<sup>31</sup>. However, the failure to detect imbalances in most of the AFAP cases reflects a putative mechanism for their attenuated nature, which may be more closely related to subtle changes at the RNA level that could lead to delayed phenotypic expression of symptoms. In fact, germline expression of the APC allele is slightly lower in these APC(-)/MUTYH(-) and shows no apparent correlation with ASE imbalance.

Methodological issues should be taken into account in the interpretation of results and have both theoretical and practical implications. According to our own and others' results, the SNaPshot approach is a suitable technique with excellent analytical sensitivity<sup>32-35</sup>. Importantly, pyrosequencing (a robust technique) yielded similar normal range values. In any case, the definition of cut-off values was improved by the inclusion of control set in every experimental run. The putative clinical relevance of borderline values emphasizes the importance of the controls. Sample processing is likely to influence the results. Aged blood has been shown to decrease NMD, thus precluding the detection of loss of allelic imbalance in the *NF1* gene<sup>29</sup>. The balanced allelic expression of the two samples with mutations outside exon 15 may be due to differences in the isolation process of peripheral blood lymphocytes. Finally, the complex pattern of transcripts at exon 11 should be considered, as it might influence ASE results. Notably, we have identified the expression of transcripts with skipping of exon 11 in controls (data not shown).

Our results may have clinical implications. Allelic imbalances detected in a small proportion of APC(-)/MUTYH(-) families point to the presence of a pathogenic event in the APC gene. Although further studies are needed to elucidate the correlation between allelic imbalance and the disease in families with no detectable mutation, it could be used as a diagnostic marker of elusive mutations in the APC gene that might be otherwise only detected by the more costly conversion approach<sup>33</sup> or by next-generation sequencing when implemented in the routine clinical setting. Based on our results, we propose a new molecular diagnostic algorithm for polyposis families that undergo APC mutation screening beginning with analysis of gross rearrangements (Figure 4). In samples with ASE imbalance, sequencing of exons 1-14 at the cDNA or gDNA level would be followed by analysis of the promoter region and, possibly, the 3'UTR region. This strategy would have made it unnecessary to sequence the largest exon of the gene (exon 15, 6574 bp) in approximately 21% of the families included in the present study (12/58). The pathogenic cause of the disease would remain unknown if sequencing of the whole coding region of APC and the promoter and 3'UTR regions, and cDNA transcript analyses targeting aberrant skipping or cryptic exons, revealed no functionally relevant changes. However, a processing protocol for preserving lymphocytes and RNA would be needed to incorporate this RNA-based assay into routine screening. Also, the addition of more polymorphisms as allele-specific markers would improve informativeness and dependability. We do not know whether missense or unclassified variants from introns 1-14 are associated with ASE imbalance. However, transcript-level analysis has shown that a significant proportion of these mutations can be classified as pathogenic and has revealed the presence of PTCs in some cases<sup>3</sup>.

Taken together, our results reinforce the importance of RNA-level studies not only for a better understanding of the disease but also for optimizing the molecular diagnostic algorithm for FAP.

# **Supplementary Material**

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

# Acknowledgments

Grant Support: - Spanish Ministry of Education and Science [AGL2004-07579-04, SAF 06-6084, SAF 2009-07319]

- Fundació "la Caixa" [BM 04-107-0]
- Fundació Gastroenterologia Dr. Francisco Vilardell [F05-01]
- Spanish Networks RTICCC [RD06/0020/1050, 1051], from the Carlos III Health Institute;
- Acción Transversal del Cáncer

- NIH/NCI R01, CA81488 and the University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center grant P30 CA46592.

- Commission for Universities and Research of the Comissionat per a Universitats i Recerca del Departament d'Innovació, Universitats i Empresa Ministry of Universities, Research and the Information Society of the Catalan government and European Social Fund grant [2005FI-00809] to E.C.

Writing assistance: We thank Laura Valle for critical assessment and helpful comments on the manuscript.

# Abbreviations

AFAP	attenuated familial adenomatous polyposis
ASE	allele-specific expression
FAP	familial adenomatous polyposis
FISH	fluorescent in-situ hybridization
MLPA	multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification
NMD	nonsense-mediated decay
PTC	premature termination codon
QMPSF	quantitative multiplex PCR of short fluorescent fragments
SNuPE	single nucleotide primer extension

# REFERENCES

- 1. Lipton L, Tomlinson I. The genetics of FAP and FAP-like syndromes. Fam Cancer 2006;5:221–6. [PubMed: 16998667]
- 2. Heinimann K, Thompson A, Locher A, Furlanetto T, Bader E, Wolf A, Meier R, Walter K, Bauerfeind P, Marra G, Muller H, Foernzler D, Dobbie Z. Nontruncating APC germ-line mutations and mismatch repair deficiency play a minor role in APC mutation-negative polyposis. Cancer Res 2001;61:7616–22. [PubMed: 11606402]
- Kaufmann A, Vogt S, Uhlhaas S, Stienen D, Kurth I, Hameister H, Mangold E, Kotting J, Kaminsky E, Propping P, Friedl W, Aretz S. Analysis of rare APC variants at the mRNA level: six pathogenic mutations and literature review. J Mol Diagn 2009;11:131–9. [PubMed: 19196998]
- Aretz S, Stienen D, Friedrichs N, Stemmler S, Uhlhaas S, Rahner N, Propping P, Friedl W. Somatic APC mosaicism: a frequent cause of familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP). Hum Mutat 2007;28:985–92. [PubMed: 17486639]

- Castellsague E, Gonzalez S, Nadal M, Campos O, Guino E, Urioste M, Blanco I, Frebourg T, Capella G. Detection of APC gene deletions using quantitative multiplex PCR of short fluorescent fragments. Clin Chem 2008;54:1132–40. [PubMed: 18487285]
- 6. Al-Tassan N, Chmiel NH, Maynard J, Fleming N, Livingston AL, Williams GT, Hodges AK, Davies DR, David SS, Sampson JR, Cheadle JP. Inherited variants of MYH associated with somatic G:C-->T:A mutations in colorectal tumors. Nat Genet 2002;30:227–32. [PubMed: 11818965]
- Brinckmann A, Mischung C, Bassmann I, Kuhnisch J, Schuelke M, Tinschert S, Nurnberg P. Detection of novel NF1 mutations and rapid mutation prescreening with Pyrosequencing. Electrophoresis 2007;28:4295–301. [PubMed: 18041031]
- Chen X, Weaver J, Bove BA, Vanderveer LA, Weil SC, Miron A, Daly MB, Godwin AK. Allelic imbalance in BRCA1 and BRCA2 gene expression is associated with an increased breast cancer risk. Hum Mol Genet 2008;17:1336–48. [PubMed: 18204050]
- Renkonen E, Zhang Y, Lohi H, Salovaara R, Abdel-Rahman WM, Nilbert M, Aittomaki K, Jarvinen HJ, Mecklin JP, Lindblom A, Peltomaki P. Altered expression of MLH1, MSH2, and MSH6 in predisposition to hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol 2003;21:3629–37. [PubMed: 14512394]
- Tournier I, Raux G, Di Fiore F, Marechal I, Leclerc C, Martin C, Wang Q, Buisine MP, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, Olschwang S, Frebourg T, Tosi M. Analysis of the allele-specific expression of the mismatch repair gene MLH1 using a simple DHPLC-Based Method. Hum Mutat 2004;23:379–84. [PubMed: 15024732]
- Perrin-Vidoz L, Sinilnikova OM, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, Lenoir GM, Mazoyer S. The nonsensemediated mRNA decay pathway triggers degradation of most BRCA1 mRNAs bearing premature termination codons. Hum Mol Genet 2002;11:2805–14. [PubMed: 12393792]
- Cartegni L, Chew SL, Krainer AR. Listening to silence and understanding nonsense: exonic mutations that affect splicing. Nat Rev Genet 2002;3:285–98. [PubMed: 11967553]
- Aretz S, Uhlhaas S, Sun Y, Pagenstecher C, Mangold E, Caspari R, Moslein G, Schulmann K, Propping P, Friedl W. Familial adenomatous polyposis: aberrant splicing due to missense or silent mutations in the APC gene. Hum Mutat 2004;24:370–80. [PubMed: 15459959]
- Yan H, Dobbie Z, Gruber SB, Markowitz S, Romans K, Giardiello FM, Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B. Small changes in expression affect predisposition to tumorigenesis. Nat Genet 2002;30:25–6. [PubMed: 11743581]
- Powell SM, Petersen GM, Krush AJ, Booker S, Jen J, Giardiello FM, Hamilton SR, Vogelstein B, Kinzler KW. Molecular diagnosis of familial adenomatous polyposis. N Engl J Med 1993;329:1982–7. [PubMed: 8247073]
- 16. Venesio T, Balsamo A, Rondo-Spaudo M, Varesco L, Risio M, Ranzani GN. APC haploinsufficiency, but not CTNNB1 or CDH1 gene mutations, accounts for a fraction of familial adenomatous polyposis patients without APC truncating mutations. Lab Invest 2003;83:1859–66. [PubMed: 14691304]
- De Rosa M, Scarano MI, Panariello L, Carlomagno N, Rossi GB, Tempesta A, Borgheresi P, Renda A, Izzo P. Three submicroscopic deletions at the APC locus and their rapid detection by quantitative-PCR analysis. Eur J Hum Genet 1999;7:695–703. [PubMed: 10482959]
- Kanter-Smoler G, Fritzell K, Rohlin A, Engwall Y, Hallberg B, Bergman A, Meuller J, Gronberg H, Karlsson P, Bjork J, Nordling M. Clinical characterization and the mutation spectrum in Swedish adenomatous polyposis families. BMC Med 2008;6:10. [PubMed: 18433509]
- Venesio T, Balsamo A, Sfiligoi C, Fuso L, Molatore S, Ranzani GN, Risio M. Constitutional high expression of an APC mRNA isoform in a subset of attenuated familial adenomatous polyposis patients. J Mol Med 2007;85:305–12. [PubMed: 17143620]
- Renkonen ET, Nieminen P, Abdel-Rahman WM, Moisio AL, Jarvela I, Arte S, Jarvinen HJ, Peltomaki P. Adenomatous polyposis families that screen APC mutation-negative by conventional methods are genetically heterogeneous. J Clin Oncol 2005;23:5651–9. [PubMed: 16110024]
- Norton N, Williams NM, Williams HJ, Spurlock G, Kirov G, Morris DW, Hoogendoorn B, Owen MJ, O'Donovan MC. Universal, robust, highly quantitative SNP allele frequency measurement in DNA pools. Hum Genet 2002;110:471–8. [PubMed: 12073018]

- 22. Groden J, Thliveris A, Samowitz W, Carlson M, Gelbert L, Albertsen H, Joslyn G, Stevens J, Spirio L, Robertson M, et al. Identification and characterization of the familial adenomatous polyposis coli gene. Cell 1991;66:589-600. [PubMed: 1651174]
- 23. Horii A, Nakatsuru S, Ichii S, Nagase H, Nakamura Y. Multiple forms of the APC gene transcripts and their tissue-specific expression. Hum Mol Genet 1993;2:283-7. [PubMed: 8388766]
- 24. Oshima M, Sugiyama H, Kitagawa K, Taketo M. APC gene messenger RNA: novel isoforms that lack exon 7. Cancer Res 1993;53:5589–91. [PubMed: 8242607]
- 25. Sulekova Z, Ballhausen WG. A novel coding exon of the human adenomatous polyposis coli gene. Hum Genet 1995;96:469-71. [PubMed: 7557972]
- 26. Sulekova Z, Reina-Sanchez J, Ballhausen WG. Multiple APC messenger RNA isoforms encoding exon 15 short open reading frames are expressed in the context of a novel exon 10A-derived sequence. Int J Cancer 1995;63:435-41. [PubMed: 7591245]
- 27. Thliveris A, Samowitz W, Matsunami N, Groden J, White R. Demonstration of promoter activity and alternative splicing in the region 5' to exon 1 of the APC gene. Cancer Res 1994;54:2991-5. [PubMed: 8187087]
- 28. Andreutti-Zaugg C, Scott RJ, Iggo R. Inhibition of nonsense-mediated messenger RNA decay in clinical samples facilitates detection of human MSH2 mutations with an in vivo fusion protein assay and conventional techniques. Cancer Res 1997;57:3288-93. [PubMed: 9242462]
- 29. Pros E, Larriba S, Lopez E, Ravella A, Gili ML, Kruver H, Valls J, Serra E, Lazaro C, NF1 mutation rather than individual genetic variability is the main determinant of the NF1transcriptional profile of mutations affecting splicing. Hum Mutat 2006;27:1104–14. [PubMed: 16937374]
- 30. Khajavi M, Inoue K, Lupski JR. Nonsense-mediated mRNA decay modulates clinical outcome of genetic disease. Eur J Hum Genet 2006;14:1074-81. [PubMed: 16757948]
- 31. Milani L, Gupta M, Andersen M, Dhar S, Fryknas M, Isaksson A, Larsson R, Syvanen AC. Allelic imbalance in gene expression as a guide to cis-acting regulatory single nucleotide polymorphisms in cancer cells. Nucleic Acids Res 2007;35:e34. [PubMed: 17267408]
- 32. Bray NJ, Buckland PR, Owen MJ, O'Donovan MC. Cis-acting variation in the expression of a high proportion of genes in human brain. Hum Genet 2003;113:149–53. [PubMed: 12728311]
- 33. Valle L, Serena-Acedo T, Liyanarachchi S, Hampel H, Comeras I, Li Z, Zeng Q, Zhang HT, Pennison MJ, Sadim M, Pasche B, Tanner SM, de la Chapelle A. Germline allele-specific expression of TGFBR1 confers an increased risk of colorectal cancer. Science 2008;321:1361-5. [PubMed: 18703712]
- 34. Yan H, Yuan W, Velculescu VE, Vogelstein B, Kinzler KW. Allelic variation in human gene expression. Science 2002;297:1143. [PubMed: 12183620]
- 35. Zhang Y, Wang D, Johnson AD, Papp AC, Sadee W. Allelic expression imbalance of human mu opioid receptor (OPRM1) caused by variant A118G. J Biol Chem 2005;280:32618-24. [PubMed: 16046395]
- 36. Menendez M, Gonzalez S, Obrador-Hevia A, Dominguez A, Pujol MJ, Valls J, et al. Functional characterization of the novel APC N1026S variant associated with attenuated familial adenomatous polyposis. Gastroenterology 2008;134:56-64. [PubMed: 18166348]

NIH-PA Author Manuscript





Regression analysis of the amplification products of two homozygous control cDNAs mixed in different proportions and analyzed in triplicate by SNaPshot. Allele frequencies were calculated by the peak heights: freq. C = C/(C+kT), where the correction factor *k* is determined from the mix simulating an actual allele frequency of 0.5 (5:5). Measured allele frequencies were plotted against the expected values. A near-linear relationship was observed across all data points (R2 = 0.9983).

Castellsagué et al.



#### Figure 2. Quantification of ASE in APC(+) polyposis patients

A. Distribution of APC ASE in controls, non-carriers and carriers of a pathogenic APC mutation from the ICO and UM subsets. ASE values are the proportion between the C and T allele frequencies of the APC coding SNP rs2229992. Each point represents the mean of the triplicate measurements, and each replicate was performed for all samples in each subset. Allelic ratios ranged from 0.646 to 8.706. The normal ASE cut-off range is indicated by dashed horizontal lines (at 1.168 and 0.836) and determined by control ASE values, as indicated in Patients and Methods. Three sample electropherograms obtained from the SNaPshot reaction, and their corresponding ASE values, are also shown. **B.** Box plots of ASE values for the location of the mutation in the APC gene. Patients were stratified into two groups by mutation site ("Outside e15", mutation located from exons 1-14; and "Inside e15", mutation located in exon 15). To give an overview of our results, ASE values are represented as the proportion of allelic frequencies between the underexpressed and the overexpressed allele in each sample, independently if whether it is C or T. The interquartile range includes 50% of the samples and is shown by white boxes. The interdecile range includes 90% of the patients and is shown as whiskers. Outliers are shown by empty dots. Mutated groups were compared using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney test.



#### Figure 3. Quantification of ASE in APC(-)/MUTYH(-) polyposis patients

Distribution of *APC* ASE in controls and polyposis patients with no previously identified mutation. ASE values are the proportion between the C and T allele frequencies of the *APC* coding SNP rs2229992. Each point represents the mean of the triplicate measurements, and each replicate was performed for all samples in each subset. Allelic ratios ranged from 0.756 to 1.284. The normal ASE cut-off range is indicated by dashed horizontal lines (at 1.168 and 0.836).



#### Figure 4.

Proposed diagnostic algorithm for *APC* mutation screening including ASE measurement in polyposis families.

Table 1

Characteristics of the APC(+) polyposis families analyzed for ASE

**NIH-PA** Author Manuscript

Castellsagué et al.

in (+)Puromycin T) (freqC/freqT)									1.090																
ASE (-)Puromyc (freqC/freq									0.773																
ASE±SD (freq C/freq T)	$0.830 {\pm} 0.036$	$0.911 \pm 0.250$	$0.964 \pm 0.010$	$0.876 \pm 0.018$	$1.062 \pm 0.025$	$0.949\pm0.010$	$0.964 \pm 0.032$	$0.974\pm0.049$	$0.838 \pm 0.030$	$1.055\pm0.093$	$0.907 \pm 0.042$	$0.924 \pm 0.073$	$0.892 \pm 0.050$	$1.015\pm0.121$	$0.944\pm0.039$	$0.950 \pm 0.023$	$0.943 \pm 0.013$	$0.932 \pm 0.045$	$0.951 \pm 0.039$	$1.028 \pm 0.016$	$1.009 \pm 0.049$	$0.929\pm0.029$	$1.054\pm0.039$	$1.086 \pm 0.099$	loss of T
Reference	2,3	This study	This study	ю	This study	This study	This study	[36]	1,2,3	1,2,3	1,2,3	This study	This study	1,2,3	This study	1,2,3	1,3	1,2,3	1,2,3	This study	This study	This study	1	1	This study
Type of mutation	Splicing	Frameshift	Frameshift	Nonsense	Nonsense	Nonsense	Frameshift	Missense	Frameshift	Frameshift	Frameshift	Frameshift	Missense	Nonsense	Frameshift	Frameshift	Nonsense	Frameshift	Frameshift	Frameshift	Frameshift	Frameshift	Frameshift	Frameshift	Gross deletion
Exon or intron	i14^	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	e15	?-e4
Mutation*	c.1958+3A>G	c.2004del; p.Leu669X	c.2116del; p.Met706CysfsX12	c.2397T>A; p.Tyr799X	c.2701C>T; pGln901X	c.2701C>T; pGln901X	c.2727del; p.Thr910LeufsX6	c.3077A>G, p.Asn1026Ser	c.3183_3187del; p.Gln1062X	c.3183_3187del; p.Gln1062X	c.3183_3187del; p.Gln1062X	c.3562del; p.Pro1188LeufsX77	c.3631A>G; p.Met1211Val	c.3688C>T; p.Gln1230X	c.3838_3839del; p.Leu1280ValfsX4	c.3927_3931del; p.Glu1309AspfsX4	c.4189G>T; p.Glu1397X	c.4393_4394del; p.Ser1465TrpfsX3	c.4393_4394del; p.Ser1465TrpfsX3	c.4608_4614del; p.Glu1536AspfsX27	c.4608_4614del; p.Glu1536AspfsX27	c.4782_4785del; p.Ala1595ArgfsX54	c.5936_5939del; p.Asn1979ThrfsX64	c.5936_5939del; p.Asn1979ThrfsX64	Deletion promoter-e4
Phenotype	FAP	AFAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	AFAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	AFAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	FAP	AFAP	AFAP	AFAP	AFAP
Family	8	0-M-6	19	15	14	14	11	27	6	13	22	12	26	UM-4	16	18	17	20	21	10	10	UM-7	UM-1	UM-10	UM-8
vidual		ę				-	10	٢	2	6	0	~	4	4					10	~	-	L	-	-10	8-]

Individual	Family	Phenotype	Mutation*	Exon or intron	Type of mutation	Reference	ASE±SD (freq C/freq T)	ASE (-)Puromycin (freqC/freqT)	ASE (+)Puromycin (freqC/freqT)
54	1	FAP	c.423-2A>G	i3	Splicing	This study	$0.738 \pm 0.031$	0.621	0.997
161	2	FAP	c.423-2A>G	i3	Splicing	This study	$0.823 \pm 0.069$		
163	2	FAP	c.423-2A>G	i3	Splicing	This study	$0.853\pm0.028$		
165	7	FAP	c.423-2A>G	i3	Splicing	This study	$0.717\pm0.019$	0.497	0.952
UM-2	UM-2	AFAP	c.426_427del; p.Leu143AlafsX4	64	Frameshift	2	$1.155\pm0.061$		
UM-3	UM-3	AFAP	c.426_427del; p.Leu143AlafsX4	e4	Frameshift	7	$1.214\pm0.020$		
0-MU	6-MU	AFAP	c.464_465del; p.Lys155ArgfsX12	e4	Frameshift	This study	$1.133\pm0.043$		
46	б	FAP	c.607C>T; p.Gln203X	e5	Nonsense	1	$1.626 \pm 0.008$		
47	ю	FAP	c.607C>T; p.Gln203X	e5	Nonsense	1	$1.451 \pm 0.049$	2.164	1.083
116	23	AFAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.680 \pm 0.027$		
117	23	AFAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	0.677±0.006		
118	23	AFAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.728 \pm 0.011$		
119	23	AFAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.713 \pm 0.006$		
122	23	AFAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.734 \pm 0.021$		
10	4	FAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.682 \pm 0.029$		
11	4	FAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.722 \pm 0.029$		
12	4	FAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.646\pm0.024$		
13	4	FAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.687 \pm 0.042$		
14	4	FAP	c.834+1G>A	i7	Splicing	2,3	$0.725 \pm 0.014$		
18	5	FAP	c.1262_1263delinsAA; p.Trp421X	e9	Nonsense	This study	$0.779\pm0.022$		
21	5	FAP	c.1262_1263delinsAA; p.Trp421X	e9	Nonsense	This study	$0.721 \pm 0.024$	0.525	1.069
106	24	AFAP	c.1557_1561del; p.Cys520TyrfsX15	e12	Frameshift	This study	$7.911\pm0.337$	13.800	6.353
107	24	AFAP	c.1557_1561del; p.Cys520TyrfsX15	e12	Frameshift	This study	$8.706 \pm 0.468$		
108	24	AFAP	c.1557_1561del; p.Cys520TyrfsX15	e12	Frameshift	This study	$8.387 {\pm} 0.882$		
105	25	AFAP	c.1699G>T; p.Gly567X	e13	Nonsense	This study	$0.804{\pm}0.022$	0.692	1.090
63	9	FAP	c.1660C>T; p.Arg554X	e13	Nonsense	1,2,3	$1.238\pm0.047$	2.152	1.069
32	7	FAP	c.1660C>T; p.Arg554X	e13	Nonsense	1,2,3	$1.223 \pm 0.039$	2.255	1.153

Gastroenterology. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2011 August 1.

Castellsagué et al.

Page 17

**NIH-PA** Author Manuscript

SD, standard deviation. e, exon. i, intron.

\* Reference accession number: NM\_000038. Imbalanced ASE values are depicted in bold letters. Considered as exon 15-mutation because leads to a PTC in exon 15. For further details about the mutations reported we refer to three APC gene mutation databases: (1) the Universal Mutation Database thtp://www.LOVD.nl/APC and .(3) http://www.hgmd.cf.ac.uk/ac/index.php.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Castellsagué et al.

# Table 2

Ш
Ś
<
- 2
5
Ψ
Ч
e
2
- <u>-</u> -
Ia
H
S
÷Ĕ
Ē
Ξ
, e
÷
IS.
S
g
4
- <u>-</u> `
2
뚜
Ě
·)H/
TYH(-
)HYH(
UTYH(-
MUTYH(-
)/MUTYH(-
-)HATUM\(-
-) <i>HALUM</i> /(–),
C(-)/MUTYH(-)
PC(-)/MUTYH(-
APC(-)/MUTYH(-
APC(-)/MUTYH(-
he $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
s of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
ics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
stics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
cistics of the <i>APC</i> (–)/ <i>MUTYH</i> (-
eristics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
cteristics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
acteristics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
tracteristics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
haracteristics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$
Characteristics of the $APC(-)/MUTYH(-)$

158     29     FAP     1.384±0.060     2.099     0.963       166     30     FAP     1.063±0.047     0.095     0.963       170     31     FAP     1.063±0.047     0.095     0.963       171     32     FAP     1.045±0.055     1.042±0.011     1.045±0.056       171     32     FAP     0.947±0.034     0.947±0.034     0.947±0.034       175     33     FAP     0.903±0.041     0.993±0.041     0.993±0.041       173     35     AFAP     0.903±0.041     0.903±0.041     0.993±0.015       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.025     0.993±0.025     0.993       140     39     AFAP     0.991±0.025     0.993     0.993       147     41     AFAP     0.991±0.025     0.993     0.993       147     41     AFAP     0.991±0.025     0.993     0.993       147     41     AFAP     0.991±0.025     0.993     0.993     0.993       152     42     AFAP     0.991	Individual	Family	Phenotype	ASE±SD (freq C / freq T)	ASE (-)Puromycin (freqC/freqT)	ASE (+)Puromycin (freqC/freqT)
166     30     FAP     1.083±0.047       170     31     FAP     1.085±0.136       171     32     FAP     1.045±0.055       172     32     FAP     1.045±0.030       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.030       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.030       175     33     FAP     0.947±0.034       175     33     AFAP     0.994±0.030       134     36     AFAP     0.991±0.025       136     37     AFAP     0.901±0.047       136     37     AFAP     0.901±0.025       140     38     AFAP     0.901±0.025       141     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       142     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       143     38     AFAP     0.901±0.025       144     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       144     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       144     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       144     AFAP	158	29	FAP	$1.284 \pm 0.060$	2.099	0.963
170     31     FAP     1.059±0.136       171     32     FAP     1.045±0.055       172     32     FAP     1.042±0.011       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.030       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.031       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.031       175     33     FAP     0.903±0.041       132     35     AFAP     0.903±0.041       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.041       135     37     AFAP     0.903±0.041       136     37     AFAP     0.903±0.041       136     37     AFAP     0.903±0.043       136     37     AFAP     0.903±0.043       140     39     AFAP     0.901±0.047       141     AFAP     0.901±0.043     0.914±0.034       143     43     AFAP     0.901±0.043       144     AFAP     0.901±0.043     0.914±0.034       144     AFAP     0.901±0.043     0.914±0.044       153 </td <td>166</td> <td>30</td> <td>FAP</td> <td><math>1.083 \pm 0.047</math></td> <td></td> <td></td>	166	30	FAP	$1.083 \pm 0.047$		
171     32     FAP     1.045±0.055       172     32     FAP     1.042±0.011       173     32     FAP     0.890±0.030       174     33     FAP     0.890±0.034       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.034       129     34     AFAP     0.947±0.034       132     35     AFAP     0.903±0.041       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.041       135     37     AFAP     0.903±0.041       136     37     AFAP     0.903±0.026       136     37     AFAP     0.903±0.021       137     AFAP     0.903±0.021     0.993       140     38     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.047       153     43     AFAP     0.901±0.047       154     40     AFAP     0.901±0.047       155     47     0.91±0.025     0.943±0.024       157     47     0.924±0.034     0.914±0.034       157	170	31	FAP	$1.059 \pm 0.136$		
172     32     FAP     1.042±0.011       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.030       175     33     FAP     0.890±0.030       129     34     AFAP     0.903±0.041       132     35     AFAP     0.903±0.041       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.041       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.041       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.056       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.021       134     37     AFAP     0.903±0.021       134     37     AFAP     0.901±0.025       140     39     AFAP     0.901±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.047       153     43     AFAP     0.901±0.025       154     43     AFAP     0.91±0.025       155     43     AFAP     0.91±0.025       154     1.002±0.015     0.91±0.026     0.91±0.026       155	171	32	FAP	$1.045 \pm 0.055$		
175     33     FAP     0.890±0.030       129     34     AFAP     0.947±0.034       132     35     AFAP     0.947±0.034       133     35     AFAP     0.947±0.036       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.021       134     36     AFAP     0.922±0.027       136     37     AFAP     0.922±0.027       138     38     AFAP     0.991±0.026       140     39     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.047       152     42     AFAP     0.901±0.047       153     43     0.91±0.025     0.991±0.025       UM-11     UM-11     AFAP     0.91±0.024       UM-12     UM-13     AFAP     0.91±0.025       UM-14     AFAP     0.91±0.025     0.91±0.024       UM-15     UM-16     UM-16     0.91±0.026       UM-16     UM-16     0.91±0.026     0.91±0.026  U	172	32	FAP	$1.042 \pm 0.011$		
129     34     AFAP     0.947±0.034       132     35     AFAP     0.903±0.041       134     36     AFAP     1.016±0.066       134     36     AFAP     0.903±0.019       136     37     AFAP     0.988±0.019       136     37     AFAP     0.922±0.027       138     38     AFAP     0.998±0.019       138     38     AFAP     0.998±0.024       140     39     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025       148     AFAP     0.91±0.025        152     42     AFAP     0.91±0.025       153     43     AFAP     0.91±0.026       154     UM-14     UM-15     UM-16       10M-16     UM-16 <td>175</td> <td>33</td> <td>FAP</td> <td><math>0.890 \pm 0.030</math></td> <td></td> <td></td>	175	33	FAP	$0.890 \pm 0.030$		
132     35     AFAP     0.903±0.041       134     36     AFAP     1.016±0.066       136     37     AFAP     0.922±0.027       138     37     AFAP     0.922±0.027       138     37     AFAP     0.922±0.024       140     39     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.047       152     42     AFAP     0.901±0.047       153     43     AFAP     0.914±0.035       UM-11     UM-11     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-12     UM-13     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-14     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-16     UM-16	129	34	AFAP	$0.947 \pm 0.034$		
134     36     AFAP     1.016±0.066       136     37     AFAP     0.922±0.027       138     38     AFAP     0.922±0.024       138     38     AFAP     0.922±0.024       140     39     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.047       152     42     AFAP     0.901±0.047       153     43     AFAP     0.901±0.047       153     43     AFAP     0.901±0.047       154     0.M-11     AFAP     0.901±0.047       155     42     AFAP     0.901±0.047       154     0.M-11     AFAP     0.901±0.047       155     43     AFAP     0.901±0.047       156     UM-14     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-15     UM-16     UM-16     0.914±0.034       UM-16     UM-16     AFAP     1.002±0.074       UM-18     UM-16     UM-16     UM-16       UM-	132	35	AFAP	$0.903 \pm 0.041$		
136   37   AFAP   0.922±0.027     138   38   AFAP   0.988±0.019     138   38   AFAP   0.988±0.019     140   39   AFAP   0.988±0.025   0.999     145   40   AFAP   0.991±0.025   0.991±0.025     147   41   AFAP   0.901±0.025   0.901±0.047     152   42   AFAP   0.901±0.047   0.994     153   43   AFAP   0.901±0.047   0.994     153   43   AFAP   0.901±0.047   0.914±0.034     UM-11   UM-11   AFAP   0.914±0.034   0.914±0.034     UM-12   UM-13   AFAP   0.914±0.034   0.914±0.034     UM-14   UM-14   AFAP   0.914±0.034   0.914±0.034     UM-15   UM-16   M-16   0.914±0.034   0.914±0.034     UM-16   UM-16   AFAP   1.002±0.074   0.914±0.034     UM-18   UM-16   M-16   0.914±0.034   0.914±0.034     UM-18   UM-18   UM-18   0.914±0.034   0.914±0.034 <t< td=""><td>134</td><td>36</td><td>AFAP</td><td><math>1.016 \pm 0.066</math></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	134	36	AFAP	$1.016 \pm 0.066$		
138     38     AFAP     0.988±0.019       140     39     AFAP <b>0.981±0.024</b> 0.989     0.998       145     40     AFAP <b>0.91±0.025</b> 0.91±0.025     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     0.901±0.025     0.901±0.047     0.939     0.998       152     42     AFAP     0.901±0.047     0.91±0.047     0.91±0.047     0.91±0.047       153     43     AFAP     0.901±0.047     0.92±0.015     0.91±0.047       UM-11     UM-11     AFAP     0.91±0.047     0.91±0.047     0.91±0.024       UM-12     UM-13     AFAP     0.914±0.034     0.91±0.024     0.91±0.024       UM-14     UM-15     UM-16     M-16     0.91±0.024     0.91±0.024       UM-16     UM-16     AFAP     1.002±0.074     0.91±0.024     0.99±0.074       UM-18     UM-18     AFAP     0.99±0.074     0.90±0.074     0.99±0.074       UM-19     UM-18     UM-19     UM-19     0.877±0.029     0.99±0.073     0.99±0.073	136	37	AFAP	$0.922 \pm 0.027$		
140     39     AFAP <b>0.819±0.024</b> 0.989     0.998       145     40     AFAP     0.991±0.025     0.991±0.025     0.991±0.025       147     41     AFAP     1.005±0.033     1.005±0.033     0.991±0.047       152     42     AFAP     0.901±0.047     0.901±0.047     0.901±0.047       153     43     AFAP     0.901±0.047     0.901±0.047     0.901±0.047       UM-11     UM-11     AFAP     0.901±0.047     0.914±0.015     0.914±0.034       UM-12     UM-13     AFAP     0.914±0.034     0.914±0.034     0.914±0.034       UM-14     UM-15     UM-16     UM-16     UM-16     UM-16     UM-16       UM-15     UM-16     UM-16     0.914±0.034     0.914±0.036	138	38	AFAP	$0.988 \pm 0.019$		
145 40 AFAP 0.991±0.025   147 41 AFAP 1.005±0.033   152 42 AFAP 0.901±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.991±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.991±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.991±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.992±0.015   UM-11 UM-11 AFAP 0.924±0.024   UM-12 UM-12 AFAP 0.914±0.034   UM-14 UM-14 AFAP 0.914±0.034   UM-15 UM-16 AFAP 1.002±0.074   UM-16 UM-16 AFAP 1.070±0.061   UM-18 UM-18 AFAP 1.070±0.061   UM-19 UM-19 AFAP 0.877±0.029   UM-20 UM-20 0.999±0.073	140	39	AFAP	$0.819 \pm 0.024$	0.989	0.998
147 41 AFAP 1.005±0.033   152 42 AFAP 0.901±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.901±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.901±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.901±0.047   UM-11 UM-11 AFAP 0.929±0.015   UM-12 UM-12 AFAP 0.943±0.024   UM-14 UM-14 AFAP 0.914±0.034   UM-15 UM-15 AFAP 1.002±0.074   UM-16 UM-16 AFAP 1.070±0.061   UM-18 UM-18 AFAP 1.070±0.061   UM-19 UM-19 AFAP 0.877±0.029   UM-20 UM-20 0.999±0.073	145	40	AFAP	$0.991 \pm 0.025$		
152 42 AFAP 0.901±0.047   153 43 AFAP 0.929±0.015   UM-11 UM-11 AFAP 0.929±0.015   UM-11 UM-11 AFAP 0.929±0.015   UM-12 UM-12 AFAP 0.943±0.024   UM-14 UM-14 AFAP 0.943±0.024   UM-15 UM-14 AFAP 0.914±0.034   UM-16 UM-15 AFAP 1.002±0.074   UM-16 UM-16 AFAP 1.138±0.026   UM-18 UM-18 AFAP 1.070±0.061   UM-19 UM-19 AFAP 0.877±0.029   UM-20 UM-20 0.99±0.073	147	41	AFAP	$1.005 \pm 0.033$		
I53 43 AFAP 0.929±0.015   UM-11 UM-11 AFAP <b>0.756±0.122</b> UM-12 UM-12 AFAP <b>0.943±0.024</b> UM-14 UM-14 AFAP 0.914±0.034   UM-15 UM-15 AFAP 0.914±0.034   UM-16 UM-16 AFAP 1.002±0.074   UM-16 UM-16 AFAP 1.070±0.061   UM-18 UM-19 AFAP 0.877±0.029   UM-19 UM-19 AFAP 0.99±0.073	152	42	AFAP	$0.901 \pm 0.047$		
UM-11     UM-11     AFAP <b>0.756±0.122</b> UM-12     UM-12     AFAP     0.943±0.024       UM-14     UM-14     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-15     UM-15     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-16     UM-15     AFAP     1.002±0.074       UM-16     UM-16     AFAP     1.138±0.026       UM-18     UM-19     AFAP     1.070±0.061       UM-19     UM-19     AFAP     0.877±0.029       UM-20     UM-20     0.99±0.073     0.99±0.073	153	43	AFAP	$0.929 \pm 0.015$		
UM-12     UM-12     AFAP     0.943±0.024       UM-14     UM-14     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-15     UM-15     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-16     UM-16     AFAP     1.002±0.074       UM-16     UM-16     AFAP     1.138±0.026       UM-18     UM-18     AFAP     1.070±0.061       UM-19     UM-19     AFAP     0.877±0.029       UM-20     UM-20     0.999±0.073     0.999±0.073	UM-11	UM-11	AFAP	$0.756\pm0.122$		
UM-14     UM-14     AFAP     0.914±0.034       UM-15     UM-15     AFAP     1.002±0.074       UM-16     UM-16     AFAP     1.138±0.026       UM-18     UM-18     AFAP     1.070±0.061       UM-19     UM-19     AFAP     0.877±0.029       UM-20     UM-20     0.999±0.073	UM-12	UM-12	AFAP	$0.943\pm0.024$		
UM-15     UM-15     AFAP     1.002±0.074       UM-16     UM-16     AFAP     1.138±0.026       UM-18     UM-18     AFAP     1.070±0.061       UM-19     UM-19     AFAP     0.877±0.029       UM-20     UM-20     0.999±0.073     0.999±0.073	UM-14	UM-14	AFAP	$0.914 \pm 0.034$		
UM-16 UM-16 AFAP 1.138±0.026 UM-18 UM-18 AFAP 1.070±0.061 UM-19 UM-19 AFAP 0.877±0.029 UM-20 UM-20 0.999±0.073	UM-15	UM-15	AFAP	$1.002 \pm 0.074$		
UM-18 UM-18 AFAP 1.070±0.061 UM-19 UM-19 AFAP 0.877±0.029 UM-20 UM-20 0.999±0.073	UM-16	UM-16	AFAP	$1.138 \pm 0.026$		
UM-19 UM-19 AFAP 0.877±0.029 UM-20 UM-20 0.999±0.073	UM-18	UM-18	AFAP	$1.070 \pm 0.061$		
UM-20 UM-20 0.999±0.073	UM-19	UM-19	AFAP	$0.877 \pm 0.029$		
	UM-20	UM-20		$0.999\pm0.073$		