Biosafety Assessment of Site-directed Transgene Integration in Human Umbilical Cord–lining Cells

Jaichandran Sivalingam^{1,2}, Shruti Krishnan¹, Wai Har Ng¹, Sze Sing Lee¹, Toan Thang Phan^{3,4} and Oi Lian Kon^{1,2}

¹Division of Medical Sciences, Laboratory of Applied Human Genetics, Humphrey Oei Institute of Cancer Research, National Cancer Centre, Singapore, Republic of Singapore; ²Department of Biochemistry, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Republic of Singapore; ³Department of Surgery, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore; ⁴CellResearch Corporation, Singapore, Republic of Singapore

Biosafety and efficacy considerations that impede clinical application of gene therapy could be addressed by nonviral ex vivo cell therapy, utilizing transgenic cells that have been comprehensively pre-evaluated for genotoxic potential and transgene expression. We evaluated the genotoxic potential of phiC31 bacteriophage integrasemediated transgene integration in cord-lining epithelial cells (CLECs) readily cultured from the outer membrane of human umbilical cords, by sequencing and mapping integration sites, spectral karyotyping, high-resolution genome copy number, transcriptome, and transgene copy number analyses and in vivo tumorigenicity. Of 44 independent integration events, <5% were exonic and 85% of modified cells had integrated ≤ 2 transgene(s). Expression of 95.6% of genes was unaltered in modified cells. Only three small regions showed genome copy number changes that did not correlate with altered gene expression or integration sites. Spectral karyotyping revealed rare nonrecurrent occurrence of three different translocations. Integrase-modified cells were not tumorigenic in immunocompromised mice for at least 4 months. Stable integration of a human factor VIII (FVIII) construct conferred durable FVIII secretion in vitro. Xenoimplantation of FVIII-secreting CLECs in immunocompetent hemophilic mice achieved significant phenotypic correction. Pre-evaluated clonal populations of phiC31 integrase-modified CLECs could be useful as bioimplants for monogenic diseases such as hemophilia.

Received 22 September 2009; accepted 16 March 2010; published online 27 April 2010. doi:10.1038/mt.2010.61

INTRODUCTION

The umbilical cord is a source of different cell types with stem-like characteristics.^{1,2} The outer cord lining is a monolayer of amniotic epithelium derived from the embryonic epiblast.³ Primary cells with a cobblestone epithelial morphology readily grow out from outer lining membrane explants *in vitro* and can be cryopreserved

indefinitely.⁴ These cord-lining epithelial cells (CLECs) express Oct-4, Nanog, and type I and II keratins. We have shown that CLECs can be obtained consistently from the amniotic epithelium in clinically relevant quantities, *i.e.*, about 6×10^9 cells per cord even before passaging in culture,⁵ a somewhat less limiting yield than cord blood stem/progenitor cells.⁶⁻⁸ Moreover, cord-derived cells are readily modified *ex vivo* to express transgenes stably⁹ and do not form teratomas *in vivo*.¹⁰ These characteristics, together with their noninvasive and ethically uncontroversial derivation, prompted us to investigate the feasibility of developing CLECs as cellular carriers of therapeutic transgenes.

Nonhematopoietic ex vivo cell therapy to correct specific gene deficiencies may overcome major hurdles of conventional gene therapy that, after >40 years, has yet to become standard of clinical care.11 Unlike the known risks of administering randomly integrating gene transfer vectors in vivo, ex vivo modification of somatic cells could be more efficient and allows stably modified cells to be screened in vitro for evidence of therapeutic efficacy. Stable genomic modification of hematopoietic stem cells by randomly integrating vectors has been shown to be genotoxic and associated with adverse clinical events.^{12,13} The nature of the expressed transgene and the specific disease treated appear to influence the risk of adverse clinical effects, as no untoward outcomes were noted in similar clinical trials for ADA-deficient SCID.14 Techniques that mediate site-directed transgene integration should mitigate genotoxic risk, particularly if the modification is performed ex vivo. Such an approach enables transgenic cells to be comprehensively evaluated for genotoxic potential, assuming cell characteristics are not altered by the in vivo environment. In the event that adverse genome-disruptive and/or likely oncogenic changes are identified, plans for in vivo implantation of transgenic cells can be abandoned without risking iatrogenic complications.

The bacteriophage phiC31 integrase catalyzes unidirectional integration of plasmid-encoded, *attB*-bearing transgenes into a limited number of pseudo-*attP* sites in the human genome.¹⁵ PhiC31 integrase–mediated transgene insertion has demonstrated efficacy in animal models, *e.g.*, deficiencies of fumarylacetoacetate hydrolase and dystrophin.^{16,17} Transgenic animals generated using

Correspondence: Oi Lian Kon, Laboratory of Applied Human Genetics, Humphrey Oei Institute of Cancer Research, National Cancer Centre, 11 Hospital Drive, Singapore 169610, Republic of Singapore. E-mail: dmskol@nccs.com.sg or Toan Thang Phan, Department of Surgery, National University Hospital, 5 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore 119074, Republic of Singapore. E-mail: surptt@nus.edu.sg

this technique are healthy and not cancer-prone.¹⁸ Human embryonic stem cells retained their ability to differentiate normally into all three germ layers after stable transgene integration mediated by phiC31 integrase.¹⁹ Thus, this technique of quasi-site-directed transgenesis would be expected to have superior biosafety than randomly integrating viral vectors.15 Although transgene integration sites have been identified in phiC31 integrase-modified cells, integrase-treated cells have not been comprehensively evaluated for genome-disruptive alterations because insertion of exogenous DNA into chromosomes is potentially mutagenic. This concern merits investigation as microdeletions, microinsertions, and chromosomal rearrangements have been reported at phiC31 integrase insertion sites in the mouse and human genome.^{15,20} Furthermore, primary fibroblasts from two human embryos co-transfected with phiC31 integrase, and puromycin-resistance expression plasmids showed different breakpoints on Q-banded chromosomes (observed in 3 out of 9 clones), whereas control embryonic fibroblasts transfected without integrase remained cytogenetically normal.²¹ Chromosomal abnormalities, albeit mainly nonrecurrent, were also detected in primary adult human fibroblasts in a similar study.22

The ready availability and potential of CLECs as cellular carriers of therapeutic transgenes together with emerging techniques for stable site-directed transgene integration motivated us to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the genotoxicity of phiC31 integrase in primary CLECs. We show here that phiC31 integrase induced minimal genomic and transcriptomic alterations in CLECs. Using hemophilia as a model for cell therapy, we show that phiC31 integrase-mediated integration of a human factor VIII (FVIII) transgene in CLEC induced stable FVIII secretion and corrected the phenotype of FVIII-deficient hemophilic mice.

RESULTS

CLEC characteristics

Primary cells cultured from explants of the outer lining membrane of umbilical cords expressed markers of pluripotency, *i.e.*, Oct-4 [159 base pairs (bp)] and Nanog (212 bp) transcripts (at levels ranging from 46 to 56% of a positive control human embryonic stem cell line) and the cognate proteins shown by immunoblots of CLEC protein lysates (**Figure 1a**). CLECs also expressed epithelial cell markers (universal keratins, keratins 18 and 19) and desmoplakin (**Figure 1b–e**), and could be propagated for at least 40 passages *in vitro* without loss of proliferative capacity or multipotency.

Assessing genotoxicity of stably modified CLEC

Transfection efficiency and integration frequency. The percentage of green fluorescent protein (GFP) positive cells, measured by fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) analysis, was $33 \pm 1.5\%$ and $42 \pm 2.5\%$ (mean \pm SEM, n = 3) for CLECs electroporated with pEGFPattB plasmid with or without phiC31 integrase plasmid, respectively. The efficiency of gene transfer without electroporation was <1% with or without phiC31 integrase plasmid.

From an initial seeding of 5,000 FACS-sorted EGFP-expressing CLECs (in triplicate), scoring of GFP-expressing colonies after G418 selection for 7 days yielded 134 ± 11 colonies (mean \pm SD) when co-transfection was performed with integrase, compared with 8 ± 5 cells when transfection was performed without



Figure 1 Characterization of primary human umbilical cord-lining epithelial cells (CLECs). (a) RT-PCR and western blot analysis of different CLEC samples (1–6), human embryonic stem cell line (HUES, positive control), and human primary dermal fibroblasts (negative control) for expression of Oct-4 and Nanog. Negative control for RT-PCR was a minus template PCR. Shown below RT-PCR gel images are quantitative levels of Oct-4 and Nanog transcripts (normalized to actin) relative to the HUES sample. Indirect immunofluorescence staining for (b) universal keratins; (c) desmoplakin (positive expression is seen as bright green fluorescence (arrows) and negative expression as dull orange); (d) keratin 18 and (e) keratin 19 in cultured CLECs. Original magnification ×400. bp, base pair.

integrase. Data from parallel seeding of 2,000 FACS-sorted EGFPexpressing CLECs (also in triplicate) showed 68 \pm 12 stable integrations with integrase, and 8 \pm 4 without integrase. These data indicated an average integration frequency of 3.0% with integrase compared to 0.3% without integrase.

Site-directed integration. We integrated a reporter plasmid, pattBEGFP-C1, into low-passage CLECs by co-expressing phiC31 integrase to determine the profile of integration sites in a primary human diploid cell type. We documented 44 independent integration events that mapped to 18 cytobands by sequencing 90 and 200 plasmid clones from a mixed and clonal population, respectively, of transgenic CLECs (**Table 1**). An integration was considered to be independent if chromosomal sequences flanking the integration site were different from all other integrations retrieved. Alignment of integration site sequences using the Multiple EM

	Number of independen	:			Transcriptional effect	
Cytoband	integrations (clonal or mixed population)	Integration sites	Target gene (intragenic integration)	Nearest gene (intergenic integration)	Target gene/ nearest gene	1 Mb window
1p36.31	1 Mixed	Intron 1	NPH4 (1.5 kb)		NA	No change
2p23.2	4 Mixed	Intron 2	FOSL2 (1.3 kb)		No change	No change
4q12	3 Mixed	Intergenic		CHIC2 (129 kb)	No change	LNX1 (increased)
6p21.1	1 Mixed 1 Clonal	Repeat		<i>NCR2</i> (17 kb)	No change	No change
7p14.1	2 Mixed	Exonic	<i>GLI3</i> (274 kb)		No change	No change
8p22	16 Mixed 2 Clonal	Intron 7	<i>DLC1</i> (384 kb)		No change	No change
8q24.22	1 Mixed	Repeat		NDRG1 (56 kb)	No change	No change
9q21.13	1 Mixed	Intron 4	<i>THEM2</i> (28 kb)		No change	No change
9q22.33	1 Mixed	Intergenic		C9Orf156 (0.07 kb)	No change	No change
10p12.31	2 Mixed	Intron 12	<i>DNAJC1</i> (247 kb)		No change	No change
10q22.3	1 Clonal	Intron 1	ZMIZ1 (2 kb)		NA	No change
10q26.11	1 Mixed	Repeat		<i>PDZD8</i> (17 kb)	NE	No change
12p13.33	2 Mixed	Intergenic		FBXL14 (62 kb)	No change	No change
15q25.3	1 Mixed	Intergenic		<i>AGBL1</i> (185 kb)	No change	No change
17q21.2	1 Mixed	Hypothetical gene	cDNA FLJ37962 (4 kb)		NA	No change
19q13.31	1 Mixed	Intron 2		ZNF 223 (7.8 kb)	No change	No change
20q11.23	1 Mixed	Intron 1		LOC 128434 (15 kb)	NA	No change
Xq22.1	1 Mixed	Repeat		<i>DRP2</i> (23.7 kb)	No change	No change

Table 1 PhiC31 integrase-mediated transgene integration sites in CLECs

Abbreviations: CLEC, cord-lining epithelial cell; kb, kilobase; Mb, Megabase; NA, genes for which the Affymetrix Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0 arrays did not have probe sets; NE, genes that were not expressed in wild -type CLECs.

Vector integration sites were retrieved by plasmid rescue from genomic DNA of mixed and clonal populations of CLECs stably integrated with pattBEGFP-C1. Integration site sequences were mapped to the reference human genome sequence and their corresponding cytobands (http://genome.ucsc.edu). Transcriptional effects refer to the target gene for intragenic (intronic or exonic) integrations and to the nearest gene for integrations (distance from integration site to the transcription start site is indicated within parentheses). Transcriptional effects on all genes within a 1 Mb window centered on each integration site are also shown.

for Motif Elicitation (MEME) program revealed a shared motif among 12 cytobands (E = 5.9×10^{-10}) (**Supplementary Figure S1**) that was 75% identical to a 28-base motif previously identified.¹⁵ Integrations into the 8p22 site accounted for >40% of all integrations.

We next analyzed genomic site categories of phiC31 integrasemediated integrations. Of the 44 integration events, 29 were intronic, 7 intergenic, 2 exonic, 5 within repeat elements, and 1 within a hypothetical transcriptional unit. Most integrations were intronic (29 of 31 events) and only 2 were exonic (both were 7p14.1 integrations into exon 15 of *GLI3*). Moreover, >70% of these integrations were >50 kilobases (kb) away from transcription start sites, unlike retroviral vectors that have a predilection for integrating in close proximity to transcriptional start sites.²³ Other reports have suggested that vector integrations close to promoters alter gene expression.²⁴ However, our data showed that the expression of nearly all genes located within a 1 megabase (Mb) window centered on each integration site was comparable to wild-type CLECs. The sole exception was a twofold increase in *LNX1* expression, located 476 kb from the 4q12 integration site (**Table 1**).

Transgene integrations close to or within known oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes would be cause for serious concern. In our study, three independent integration events were within potential oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes (*DLC1*, *FOSL2*, and *GLI3*). Fifteen oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes were located within a 1 Mb window among 44 independent integration sites at a median distance of 224 kb (range 2–463 kb). Despite this, none of these genes showed significantly altered expression by transcriptional profiling.

Transcriptional profile of stably modified CLEC

Comparison of the transcriptomes of wild-type and a mixed population of stably integrated CLECs showed no difference in the expression levels of >96.5% transcripts. Of 11,947 CLEC-expressed genes, 94 (0.8%) showed increased expression and 57 (0.5%) showed decreased expression (defined for both as more than twofold difference) in transgenic CLECs compared to wild-type CLECs (**Table 2**). Functional annotation using DAVID did not reveal significant association of these dysregulated genes to specific pathways except for activation of p53 signaling (*CDK2*, *CCNB1*, and *IGFBP3*) (Fisher's exact *P* value modified for gene enrichment = 0.02).

Cross-referencing 151 transcriptionally altered genes in transgenic CLEC identified 15 in a database of 1,650 possible oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes. Of these, three were tumor suppressor genes (*BRCA2*, *RAP1A*, and *TOP2A*) whose increased expression could be expected to promote cell death rather than proliferation. The remaining 12 genes were mainly involved in cell cycle regulation or cell adhesion.

Table 2 Transcriptionally altered genes in stably integrated CLECs

AppennsisCell cycleDPDC1MKXBIRCSCCCPG1HSPB6ZFYVE21Cell cycleEPDR1IIIRA4ZNI44ANINGRWMBII.1OthersASPMLAMP3JAK3COL14A1CCM12DevelopmentKF14EPB41CCN17D1K1KF14AIIMTCCN18GPC4KF20AICCAMICCN17D1K1KF14AIIMTCCN2GPC4KF20AICCAMICCN2GPC4KF20AICCAMICCN2GPC4KF20AICCAMICCN3SGCGMP19SPON1CCN5DNA repairPGKCloorf38ILCAP-GImmune reporasePIK4ENV2NUSAP1ELMODDPZNA2HRASLSRAPIAII.RL1PM1KKIAA139SOC3MetabolismPSR1KIAA139CR17GH131RAFF1ICC21691CR18GALT2TIKS00A4ADACT3AMSJS00A4ADACT3TIMU81S00A4ADACT3AMSJRC22GENTD1AREG4S00A4GALT2TIKS00A4GALT2TIKS0A4GALT2IANSS0A4GALT2IANSS0A4GALT2GALT4RKM2GALT2GALT4S0A4GALT2IANSS0A4GALT2GALT4S0A4GALT2GALT4S0A4GALT2GALT4S0A4	Overexpressed	Underexpressed	Overexpressed	Underexpressed
BRG3CCGG1HSP80Z4VVE21Cell cycleFPDR1HTRA4Z4VVE21ANLNGPMB1LAUOthersASPMLAMP3JAK3COL14A1CGN2DevelopmentKF14PBR1CCN81GPC4KF19AAPCTCCN82GPC4KF19AAPCTCCN82GPC4KF19AAPCTCCN83SGCGMMP19SPON1CCN84SGCGMMP19SPON1CCN87TSGAJ0MP1UelcomCLR74TSGAJ0PACS1BRX2CLR75DTSGAJ0PDKC100758CLR76UBE28PDKC100758DLG7UBE28PDKC100758JLG7UBE28PJXNAKIA41201NUSAPIELMOD1PSD4KIA41201SOC3MetabolismPSD4KIA41201SOC3MetabolismPSD4KIA41201SOC4PTGDSRALF/FLOC21091CCL20PTGDSRALF/FLOC21091DevelopmentSignal transductionTURB1SIG0A4ADATTS2ZMP236ADDEC38CAMP23TranscriptionADDEC38CAMP24CATA1MUT1CTPM24GATA1ADDEC38CAMP34HAELImmuto reoponicITGB5MAELImmuto reoponicITGB5MAELImmuto reoponicITGB5AARS1CMT24GATA1CACSCMT25SCI0A1GATA1FYFD4 <td>Apoptosis</td> <td>Cell cycle</td> <td>DEPDC1</td> <td>МКХ</td>	Apoptosis	Cell cycle	DEPDC1	МКХ
Cell cycleLPDR1LTRA4ZMN41OthersANNGPNBLL1OthersASIMLAMP3AK3COL14A1CCN2DevelopmentKEF4FPB41CCN21DEVKEF4HNTCCN22GPC4KE90AMPD1CCN23GPC4KE90ACAM1CDCA1GPM63LMP3UcAM1CDK31SGCGMPP1UcKnownCLNFTSGA10MPP1UcKnownCLNFTSGA10MPP1UcKnownCLNFIMmme regronzePLK4BN2DIG7UBE2 RegronzePLK4KIAA1420KLAPALIBLIPSD4KIAA1450SOC3MetablismPSD4KIAA1450CD04YGD8ALGPS2RES-STB10.1SOC3MetablismALGPS2RES-STB10.1DFL1ABCG1TUB85KIAA1850SD004ABCG1TUB85KIAA1850SD004ADAT55CUN256KIAA1850SD004ADAT55AARSKIAA1850NUTD1CYGV2GATA4KIAA1850NUTD1CYGP3AARSKIAA1850RM202GATA4KINCKIAA1850NUTD1CYGN2GATA4KINCNUTD1CYGP3AARSKIAA1850RM204GAT72GATA4KINCRM205GAT73AARSKIAA1850RM204GAT74MATCKIAA1850RM205GAT73GAT4KINCRM204<	BIRC5	CCPG1	HSPB6	ZFYVE21
ANINGPMMBLLIObsASPMLAMP3KIF14COL14A1ASPMDEX1KIF14HP41CCM2DevelopmentKIF14HNTCCM2GPC4KIF140HATCCM2GPC4LAMA1IAMA1CDCA1GPM6BLR8LAMA1CDK3SCGGMP19SPONICRN9TSGA10MP21UnknownCRN9TSGA10MP21UnknownCRN9TSGA10PIKAClosef3DIG7UBR2RPIKAClosef3HCAP-GImmune responsePIKAKIAA1450NUSAPIELMODIPINA2HRASISAPPIAU.INIAPSNIKIAA1450CCD3PICUSRAFG72RSP3HD.1CCD3PICUSTMUB1DevelopmentSignal transductionAAIG/RS2SIO0A4ADAMTS5ZN226DNA repairBGC417TUBE3APORC38C20or23AAISLPICA1GGN7LN1NUT11CYP42GATMNUT11GVM2GATMNUT11GUR3LSS6TK1GNG7LN11TUPZAMAP3GASC3GNAT2LGS6CIN1TUSAARMAGLON1TUPZAGANAGUR4HEN9GN15GLS6AH7GN16MC10TK1GNG7GN17GLS6GN17GLS6GN18GLS6AH7GN1	Cell cycle	EPDR1	HTRA4	ZNF441
ASPMLAMP3AK3COLIAA1CCNa2DevelopmentKIF14PIB41CCNa2DFK1KIF18AHNTCCNB2GPC4KIF20AFCAM/CDK3SGCGMMP19SPON1CDK3SGCGMMP19SPON1CENPFTSGA10MPF1UnknownCENPFTSGA10MPF1UnknownCENPFTSGA10PRK1ENN2DLG7UNE2BPRKC 100758DLG7UNE2BPRKC 100758CRPSDNA repairPSM1KKIAA1211SOCS3MetabolismPSM1KKIAA1221SOCS3MetabolismPSM2KIAA1439CDC13A1ARCF2TTKCO120191DOEFL1GAGT2CTR3CO120191SO0A4AGA172CNB3CAUS22DOEFL3GAMT12CAUS3CAUS42SO0A4GAMT12CAUS4CAUS42SO0A4GAMT12CAUS4CAUS4NUDT1CGN7LMS1CAUS4RMC2GAUT12CATA4CAUS4RMC3GAUT12CAUS4CAUS4COP26MCP1MM1CAUS4CMA5CAUS4MEID2COP26MCP1MAEICMA6CLUN11CHENCMA6CLUN11CHENCMA6MEID2CMA6MEID2CMA6MEID2CMA6MEID4CMA6CMM1CMA6MEID4CMA6MEID4<	ANLN	GPNMB	IL11	Others
CCM/2DevelopmentKIP4EIP41CCN82GPC4KIP18AHTCCN82GPC4KIP18AFCAM1CCN83GCCGMP19UnknownCRN5SGCGMP19UnknownCEN95DNA repairPACS1BES2DLG7UBE8PBKClOOP58HCAPGImmune responsePKMNNY2NUSAP1ELMOD1PLXNA2HRASISAPA1AILIRL1PM1KKIAA1121SOC33MetabolismPSRC1KIAA1826CDC20PTGDSRAF78LOC21091DevelopmentSignal transductionTTKSOMA4AACF2TTKU11DDEFL1ABCG1TUBB3SIGAACADVT2ARSISSIGAACADVT2ARSISSIGAAGALTT2TANSASBGALT2CATA4SCG1SIGAAGALTT2ARSISSIGAAGALTT2CATA4SIGAAGALTT2CATA4SIGAAGALTT2CATA4RM2GALTT2CATA4RM2GALTT2CASSTATAGIGSMED12CM26MP1OHer5ACAT2MM73GAG5CANT2MM43GALT2SIGAASLCMA1FRMDAAKTN1SLCMA1FRMDAAKTA1SLCMA1FRMDAAKTA1SCGAGALTT2SIGAAGALTT2FRMDAASIGAAGALTT2GALTT2GYAGSLCMA1<	ASPM	LAMP3	JAK3	COL14A1
CCN91DLK1KIBALINTCCN92GPCAKIP20AICAM7CDCA1GPM6BLR96LAMA1CDKA3SGCGMMP19VeNtownCLNF4TSGA10MPP1OwnownCLNF5TSGA10PACS1EEX2DLG7UB82BPBKCloG785HCAPGImmure responsePLK4KIAA1211KAPAGImmure responsePLK4KIAA1221SOS3MetabolismPSD4KIAA1231CGN3MetabolismPSD4KIAA1490CC020PTGD5RAU7BLOC22091CC13A1ABC2TTKS100A4ADAMTS5ZN236S100A4ADAMTS5ZN236S100A4GAMTS5ZN236S100A4GAMTS5ZN236S100A4GAMTS5TEMS1S100A4GAMTS5AARS1APOREC3CATA4SAU404S100A4GAMTS2AARS1S100A4GAMTS5CATA4S100A4GAMTS5CATA4S100A4GAMTS2AARS1S100A4GAMTS2AARS1S100A4GAMTS2AARS1S100A4GAMTS2AARS1S100A5GAMTS2AARS1S100A6GAMTS2AARS1S100A7GAMTS2AARS1S100A8GAMTS2AARS1S100A9GAMTS2AARS1S100A9GAMT2AARS1S100A9GAMT2AARS1S100A9GAMT2AARS1 <td< td=""><td>CCNA2</td><td>Development</td><td>KIF14</td><td>EPB41</td></td<>	CCNA2	Development	KIF14	EPB41
CCNB2GPC4KT20AICAMICDCA1GPM6BLRP8ICAMICDCA1GPM6BLRP8SPON1CDN7SSGCGMPP1UnknownCENPFTSGA10MPP1UnknownCEP55DNA repairPACSIBEX2DLG7BE28PLK4C10orfs8HCAP-GImmute reponsePLNA2HRASISNUSAPIELMOD1PM1K4KIAA1450SOCS3MetabolismPSD4KIAA1450SOCS4MetabolismPSD4KIAA1450CDC20PTCD5RAF7BLOC21091CDC30PTCD5RAIGPS2RPS-75110.1DevelopmentSignal transductionTMUB1C21091S100A4ADAMT55ZNE236STENS100A4ADAMT55ZNE236STENAPOEC3BC20rD2ARTSLSTENRM2GAINTL2LASS6STENNUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RM2GAINTL2LASS6CM22MCTP1MYCDMEADOINMED12CM26MCTP1MYCDMetabolismMPP1OtersCAC5CLN6MSHA6ACLDN11FM74SLC36A1FRUIN1GYS1SLC36A1MEUN1GYS1SLC36A1FRUIN1GYS1SLC36A1FRUIN1GYS1SLC36A1FRUIN1GYS1SLC36A1FRUIN1GYS1SLC36A1FRUIN1GYS1SLC36A1FRUIN1	CCNB1	DLK1	KIF18A	HNT
CDCA1GPM6BLRP8LAMA1CDKA3SCCGMMP19SPON1CENPFTSGA10MP19UuknownCEPS5DNA repairPACS1BEX2DLG7UB23BPIKC10orf8HCAP-GImune reponsePIKENY2RAPLATLIRL1PPM1KKIAA1211SOCS3MetabalismPSD4KIAA152CDC30PTGD5RAF7BLOC221091CD13A1ABCP2TUKB3COC221091COL13A1ABCP2TUKB3COC221091SI00A4ADAMTS5ZNF236KESI00A4ADAMTS5ZNF236KESI00A4CLG0723TurscriptionAPOBEC3BCLG0724GATA4RKA2CLGNARKSLRKA2GALMT12GATA4RIMMCLGNGATA4RIMMGALMT12CATA4RIMMGALMT12GATA4RIMMGALMT12GATA4RIMMGALMT12GATA4RIMMGALMT12GATA4RIMMGALMT12GATA4RIMMGALMT12GATA4RIMMGALMACALMARIMMGALMACALMARIMMGALMARIMMGALMARIMMGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMAGALMARIMMA	CCNB2	GPC4	KIF20A	ICAM1
CDKN3SGCGMMP19WMP19WithownCENPFTSGA10MP1UnknownCEP55DNA repairPSKC10orf58DIG7UBE2BPIK4ENV2HCAPGImmune responsePLXAHRASLSKAPFALLRL1PPM1KKLAA1211SOCS3MetabolismPSD4KLAA150TCLA1CH151PSRC1KLAA162CDC20PTG1DsRAF7BLOC21091CDC13A1ABC2TKFDDEFL1ABCG1TUB83FS100A4ADANT55TUB83FS100A4ADANT55TanscriptionRKCA2CENTD1ARKCA22FNUDF1CLG8ARXIFNUDF1CLG8MED12FRKA2GLANT2LASS6FTARCLGNMED12FTARCLGNMED12FFK14GLGNMED12FTARCLGNMED12FTARGLGNMED12FTARGLGA11FFRKA2MARP3MED12FTARGLGA14FRKA2MARP3GLGA14RKA2MED2MARETARGLGA14FRKA2MARP3GLGA14RKA2MED2MARETARGLGA14FRKA2MED2GLGA14RKA2MED2KTARGLGA14FRKA2MED2K	CDCA1	GPM6B	LRP8	LAMA1
CENPFTSGA10MPP1UnknownCENPFSDNA repairPACNBEX2DLG7UBE2BPACNCLOnefSDLG7Immure responsePLK4ENY2NUSAPIELMODIPLNA2IEASLSRAPIAULRL1PPMIKKIAALGSOC33MetabolismPSNC1KIAALSTCBA1CH13L1PSNC1KIAALS2CDC20PTODSRAB7BLOC221091OCC30PTODSRAB7BLOC221091DevelopmentSignal transductionTTKDEFL1ABCG1TTKDDEFL1ABCG1TTKS100A4ADAMTSSTMUB1S100A4ADAMTSSTARS2PNA repairBGALT2TranscriptionNUDT1CYP4V2GATA4NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4TK1GNG7LNX1TVP2AGRG7MAELImmure responseTGB8MED12PF4V1MEAPJLPHE19MetabolismGMP3GASCCLN6MSIA6ACLDN11ENTPASCGA1GINT1FNT4SCGA1GINT1FNT4SCGA1GINT1FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1GINT4FNT94SCGA1	CDKN3	SGCG	MMP19	SPON1
CEP55DNA repairPACS1BEX2DLG7UBE2BPBKC10orf58DLG7UBE2BPBKC10orf58HCAP-GImmun responsePLXNA2IRASLSNUSAPIELMODIPLXNA2IRASLSRAPIAILIRLIPPMIKKIAA14211SOC53MelabolismPSD4KIAA1450CDC20PTGDSRAB7BLOC21091CDC30PTGDSRALGPS2RP5.875110.1DevelopmentSignal transductionTWB1COL3A1ABCG1TTKDEFL1ABCG1TTKDEFL1B3GALT2ZNF236S100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236DNA repairB3GALT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20orB3AARSLBRA2C20orB3AARSLFIFA1CLGNRAHGAP22NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RKM2GALTY12LASS6TK1GNG7INX1TOP2AIGFB73MAELImmune responseITG8MED12COr26MCTP1WYOCDPHV1MPAP3LPHF19CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ETTP24SIC6A1ARKT04SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1SIC0A1GTS1	CENPF	TSGA10	MPP1	Unknown
DLG7UBE2BPEKCIUord58HCA-GImmune responsePLK4ENY2NUSAPIELMODIPLXNA2HRASLSNUSAPIILLRLIPPMIKKIAA1211SOCS3MetabolismPSD4KIAA1450TCBAICILDLIPSRCIKIAA1826CDC20PTGDSRAB7BCO21091DevelopmentSignal transductionTURB3S100A4ABCF2TTKS100A4ABCG1TURB3S100A4BSGALT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20or23ARIGAP22EIF4A1CLGNGATA4NUDT1CNP4V2GATA4RIKM2GALT12LASS6TK1GNG7LXX1TOP2AJGFBP3MAELImmune responseTGS8MED12Coor25MCTP1OthersAAC12MMP3CAsC5CLN6MSIAGACIDN11FTFP4SLC6A1CIDN11FTFP4SLC6A1FINIDN1GYS1SLC6A1FINIDN1FTFP4SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAFTFP4SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDAGYS1SLC6A1FINIDA<	CEP55	DNA repair	PACS1	BEX2
HCAP-GImmune responsePLK4FLN4KN72NUSAPIELMOD1PLXNA2HRASLSNUSAPIELMOD1PSN4KLAA121RAP1AI.I.R1PSN4KLAA121SOCS3MetabolismPSN4KLAA121TCBA1CH13L1PSNC1KLAA1826CDC20PTGDSRAB7BLOC21091CDC13A1ABCF2TTKDDEFL1ABCG1TTKS100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236S100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236DNA repairBSGAL72TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20orf23AARSLBRCA2CGNTD1ARGAP22EIF4A1CLGNGATA4NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4NUDT1GFBP3MAELImmune responseTGB8MED12Ord26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MAPA31PHF19MetabolismMMP1OffseGLGA1CN54SCGA4FIND4SICGA41FIND4SICGA41FIND4SICGA41FIND4SICGA41FIND4SICGA41FIND4SICGA41FIND4SICGA41FIND4SICGA41Signal transductionTME1184Signal transductionTME1184Signal transductionTME1184Signal transductionTME2184Signal transductionTME184Signal transductionTME2184Signal transductionTME1	DLG7	UBE2B	РВК	C10orf58
NUSAPIELMODIPINNA2HRASISRAPIAILIRLIPPMLKKIAA1211RAPIAILIRLIPPMLKKIAA1480SOC30MetabolismPSRCIKIAA1480TCBA1CHI3LIPSRCIKIAA1826CDC20PTGDSRAB7BLOC21091DevelopmentSignal transductionTMUBICOL13A1ABC7TMUBIS100A4ADAMTSSZNF236DNA repairB3GAIT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20or23ARRIGAP22BRCA2CENTDIARRGAMUUT1CYPAV2GATA4TK1GNG7LNXITOP2AIGG87MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12CSor16MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MPA93.PHE19MetabolismMMP1OthersCLN6SLG0A1GLINTI.CSOr16MCTP1GAS6CLN6SLG0A1GLINTI.FNVUSLG0A1GLINTI.GYS1SLG0A1GLINTI.GYS1SLG0A1GLINTI.FNTPJASLG0A1GLINTI.GYS1SLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1GLIPNIFNTPJASLG0A1SU	HCAP-G	Immune response	PLK4	ENY2
RAPIA ILIRLI PPMIK KIAA1211 SOCS3 Metabolism PSD4 KIAA1826 CBAI CHI3LI PSRCI KIAA1826 CDC20 PTGDS RAB7B LOC21091 Development Signal transduction RLGPS2 RP5-875H10.1 COL13A1 ABCF2 TWUBI F DDEFL1 ABCG1 TUBB3 F S100A4 ADAMTS5 ZNF236 F DNA repair BGALT2 Tanscription F APOBEC3B C200723 ARHGAP22 F BRCA2 CENTD1 ARHGAP22 F FH4A1 CLGN FOXM1 F NUDT1 CYP4V2 GATA4 F NUDT1 GNG7 LNX1 F TOP2A IGFBP3 MAEL F Immune response ITGB8 MED12 F CYO126 MMP1 Others F ACAT2 MMP3 CASC5 F CLN6 MMP3 CLGSAI F GYNU SLC0AI F F GYNU SLC0AI CLIN11 F FXNU SLC0AI CLIN11 F GYNU	NUSAP1	ELMOD1	PLXNA2	HRASLS
SOCS3MetabolismPSD4KIAA1450TCRA1CH13L1PSRC1KIAA1450TCRA1CH13L1PSRC1KIAA1826DC20PTGDSRAB7BLOC221091DevelopmentSignal transductionRALCPS2R5-875H10.1OC0L13A1ABCG2TTKDDEFL1ABCG1TTKS100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236DNA repairB3GALT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC200r23AARSLBRCA2CENTD1ARHGAP22EF4A1CGONFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RMA2GAINT12LASS6TK1GNG7INX1Immune responseITGB8MAELCJO26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersCLNSGLG0A1EMILN1GYS1SLC30A1GLIPR1FNTPD4SLC30A1GLIPR1FNTPD4SLC30A1GLIPR1FNTPD4SLC30A1SUT100Signal transductionTMEM118MSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM148NSUNASignal transductionTMEM1	RAPIA	IL1RL1	PPM1K	KIAA1211
TCRA1CHI3L1PSRC1KLAA1826CDC20PTGDSRAB7BLOC221091CDC20PTGDSRALGPSRP5-875H10.1DevelopmentSignal transductionTMUB1COL13A1ABCP2TTKDDEFL1ABCGITUBB3S100A4ADAMTSSZP5236DNA repairB3GALT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20ort23AARSLBRCA2CENTD1ARIGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXMINUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GSG7LNX1TOP2AIGEBP3MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12CSort26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11GYS1SLC40A1EMID4AKYNUSLC40A1EMID4AKYNUSLC40A1EMIT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMC2SHC8P1ADATS6TMC12SHC8P1ADATS6TMC2SHC8P1	SOCS3	Metabolism	PSD4	KIAA1450
CDC.20PTGDSRAB78LOC221091DevelopmentSignal transductionTMUB1COL13A1ABCF2TWB1COL13A1ABCF2TTKDDEFL1ABCG1TUBB3S100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236S100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236PAPSBC3BC20orf23ARNGAP22BRCA2CENTD1ARIGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK/GNG7LNX1TVD2AIGFB93MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12CSorf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFA93LPHF19MetabolismMMP3CLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMLINNGYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC0A1GLIPR1FTGS1SYPL2SICDSCDTMEM18AMET10DSignal transductionTMEM148ABCB6TUTC2SICDADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS6TUTC2ADAMTS	TCBA1	CHI3L1	PSRC1	KIAA1826
PerelopmentSignal transductionRALGPS2RP5-875H10.1COL13A1ABCF2TMUB1DDEFL1ABCG1TUBB3S100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236DNA repairB3GALT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20orD3ARSLBRCA2CENTD1ARHGAP22EIF4A1CLGNGATA4NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNX1TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmu responseITGB8MED12CSor26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MA93CASC5CLN6SIC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC3A1MET10DSignal transductionTMEM188NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADMTS6TAMSETIONADMTS6TAMSETIONADMTS6TAMSETIONADAMTSTAMSETION	CDC20	PTGDS	RAB7B	LOC221091
COLISA1ABCP2TMUBIDDEFL1ABCG1TTKDDEFL1ABCG1TUBB3S100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236DNA repairB3CALT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20orf23AARSLBRCA2CENTD1ARHGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT11CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNN1TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmue responseTGB8MED12CSorf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFA3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6SI2.460A1EMILN1GYS1SLC30A1ELININ1GYS1SLC30A1GLIPR1SCDTMEM18MSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADMTS6TARScriptionABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADMTS6TARScription	Development	Signal transduction	RALGPS2	RP5-875H10.1
DDEFL1ABCG1TTKS100A4ADAMTS5TUBB3S100A4ADAMTS5ZNF236DNA repairB3GALT2TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20or23ARNSLBRCA2CENTD1ARHGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TKIGNG7LNN1TOP2AIGFBP3MAEL1Immune responseITGB8MED12CSorf26MCTP1MYOCD0PF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AFTNUSLC36A1GLIPR1FTNUSLC30A1GLIPR1SCDTMEM18MSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADMTS6TamscriptionADMTS6Tamscription	COL13A1	ABCF2	TMUB1	
S100A4ADAMTS5TUBB3DNA repairB3GALT2ZNF236APOBEC3BC20orf23AARSLBRCA2CENTD1ARRGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNX1TOP2AIG5BP3MAEL12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC30A1GLIPR1FYGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118MET10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABC86TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TMAC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TMASCSHCBP1ADAMTS6TMASCSHCBP1ADAMTS6TMASCSHCBP1ADAMTS6TANSCTMASF1	DDEFL1	ABCG1	TTK	
DNA repairB3GALT2ZNF236APOBEC3BC20orf23TranscriptionAPOBEC3BC20orf23AARSLBRCA2CENTD1RRHGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNX1TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmune responseTGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MM93CASC5CLN6SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1StCDTMEM118MET10DSignal transductionTMEM118NSUN4ABC66TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TMC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TMESCMASF1	S100A4	ADAMTS5	TUBB3	
APOBEC3BC20orf23AARSLBRCA2CENTD1ARHGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNXITOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFA93LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1SCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TenscriptionTM4SF1	DNA repair	B3GALT2	ZNF236	
BRCA2CENTD1AARSLBRCA2CENTD1ARHGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7INX1TOP2AIGFBP3MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM18MET110DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TemscriptionTM4SF1	APOBEC3B	C20orf23	Transcription	
ARHGAP22EIF4A1CLGNFOXM1NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNX1TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1SCDTMEM118MET110DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TarscriptionTM4SF1	BRCA2	CENTD1	AARSL	
NUDT1CYP4V2GATA4RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNX1TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM18MET10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TmrcriptionTM4SF1OWTPAFRAD4SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	EIF4A1	CLGN	ARHGAP22	
RRM2GALNTL2LASS6TK1GNG7LNX1TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TmscriptionTM4SF1	NUDT1	CYP4V2	FOXM1	
TK1GNG7LASS6TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TanscriptionTM4SF1	RRM2	GALNTL2	GATA4	
International TOP2AIGFBP3MAELImmune responseITGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TmscriptionTM4SF1	TK1	GNG7	LASS6	
NATEMAELImmune responseITGB8MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTMASF1	TOP2A	IGFBP3	LNX1	
MED12C9orf26MCTP1MYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TmScriptionTM4SF1ONTYL PAECPASCPA	Immune response	ITGB8	MAEL	
boundMYOCDPF4V1MFAP3LPHF19MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TascriptionTM4SF1	C9orf26	MCTP1	MED12	
MetabolismMMP1OthersACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	PF4V1	MFAP3L	MYOCD	
ACAT2MMP3CASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TmTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	Metabolism	MMP1	PHF19	
IndiceCASC5CLN6MS4A6ACLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TranscriptionTM4SF1	ACAT2	MMP3	Others	
CLINGINFINITCLDN11ENTPD4SLC36A1EMILIN1GYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	CLN6	MS4A6A	CASC5	
LMTEPTSDESONTEMILINIGYS1SLC40A1FRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	ENTPD4	SLC36A1	CLDN11	
GTGYGLORATFRMD4AKYNUSLC03A1GLIPR1PTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	GYS1	SLC40A1	EMILIN1	
NTACGLORALGLIPRIPTGS1SYPL2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	KYNU	SLC03A1	FRMD4A	
FreedomSTRE2HMMRSCDTMEM118METT10DSignal transductionTMEM148NSUN4ABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	PTGS1	SVPL 2	GLIPR1	
Signal transductionTMEM148METTIODABCB6TMTC2SHCBP1ADAMTS6TranscriptionTM4SF1	SCD	TMEM118	HMMK	
ABCB6 TMTC2 NSUN4 ADAMTS6 Transcription TM4SF1	Signal transduction	TMEM148	METTIOD	
ADAMTS6 Transcription TM4SF1	ABCR6	TMTC2	NSUN4	
	ADAMTS6	Transcription	SHCBPI	
	CNTNAP3	EGR2	11/145F1	Table 2 Centinued on post

Table 2 Continued

Table 2 Continued

verexpressed	
nknown	
C21orf34	
FAM83D	
HEATR3	
HSPC049	
KIAA1524	
KIAA0101	
LOC441061	
LRRC17	
LRRTM4	
SAMD9	
WDR69	

Abbreviation: CLEC, cord-lining epithelial cell.

Gene Ontology classification of genes whose expression was twofold or more different compared to wild-type CLECs. Transcriptome profiling (Affymetrix Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0 array) was performed with a mixed population of CLECs 1 month after phiC31 integrase-mediated stable transgene integration. Potential oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes are italicized.

Genomic copy number changes in stably modified CLEC

High-resolution genome copy number analyses of genomic DNA of naive and mixed population of stably integrated cells showed that transgene integration into CLECs had quite minimal effects on genome copy number. Modest copy number gain was identified in two loci and copy number loss in one locus—none of which was a transgene integration site (**Figure 2a,b**). Moreover, genes residing within 1 Mb intervals centered on each copy number change region were unaltered in their expression. We did, however, detect a 2.1-fold and 2.5-fold increase in the expression of *PSRC1* and *SYPL2*, respectively. Given the distance of these genes from the regions of copy number gain, these transcriptional changes were probably independent of copy number gains. The data above are consistent with infrequent copy number changes in stably integrated CLECs, in contrast to multiple changes commonly observed in cancer cells.²⁵

Spectral karyotyping of stably modified CLECs

We spectrally karyotyped mixed populations of naive and stably integrated CLECs to determine whether phiC31 integrase induced chromosomal rearrangements. Although no chromosomal translocations or aneuploidy was detected in naive cells (40 metaphases), four of 90 metaphases from a mixed population of stably integrated cells had chromosomal translocations. Two translocations were observed only once [46XX *t*(7:13) (p21:q22); 46XX t(1:19) (q25, q13.3)]. A third translocation was observed twice [46XX *t*(1:18) (q25, q12)] (Figure 3a). These led us to further analyze eight clonal populations of stably integrated cells in which we found no structural or numerical chromosomal abnormalities in >210 metaphases. The presence of nonrecurrent translocations is consistent with the known low background of chromosome aberrations in normal human somatic cells.^{26,27} That the mixed population of stably modified CLECs showed no evidence of clonal expansion of cells harboring translocations also

indicated that such affected cells, when present, had no cellular growth or survival advantage.

Transgene copy number by fluorescence *in situ* hybridization

Interphase fluorescence *in situ* hybridization using probes specific to the integrated vector determined the number of integrations per cell. Examination of >200 stably modified CLECs revealed that >85% harbored either one or two integrations per cell (**Figure 3b**). The technique employed did not differentiate monoallelic from biallelic integrations, where cells had >1 integrations. The low number of integrations per cell is advantageous as it reduces the likelihood of integration into high-risk sites and paves the way for selecting single cell clones with safe integration sites that could make this approach acceptable for clinical application.

Tumorigenic potential of modified CLEC

PhiC31 integrase–mediated transgene integration did not alter the proliferative behavior of CLECs as assessed by *in vitro* colonyforming assays [26.0 \pm 0.5 (wild-type) versus 25.7 \pm 0.3 (transgene-integrated); data are mean colony counts and standard error of triplicates; *P* = 0.643].

The innate oncogenic activity of integrase-modified CLECs was evaluated by implantation into the nuchal subcutaneous region (n = 6) and renal subcapsular space (n = 4) of NOD-SCID mice (Figure 4a–c). Tumors did not develop in any site for at least 4 months after implantation, although CLECs had engrafted and were recovered by reculturing from the excised implants (Figure 4d).

FVIII secretion and phenotypic correction of hemophilic mice

Stable secretion of FVIII in vitro. We coelectroporated CLECs with pattBhFer-FVIII and pCMV-Int to derive FVIII-expressing cells. FVIII was readily detectable in conditioned media on day 3 (19.9 \pm 2.0 mU/ml per 2 \times 10⁵ cells per 24 hours) and day 15 (140 \pm 5.3 mU/ml per 2 \times 10⁵ cells per 24 hours; mean \pm SEM, n = 3) after electroporation (**Figure 5a**). CLECs stably integrated with pattBhFer-FVIII secreted FVIII unabated for at least 5 weeks *in vitro* (**Figure 5b**), whereas FVIII secretion from CLECs transfected with pattBhFer-FVIII without pCMV-Int never lasted >1 week.

In vivo FVIII secretion following implantation. In vivo secretion of transgenic FVIII was shown when subcutaneous implantation of 8×10^6 Matrigel-encapsulated, stably integrated CLECs significantly raised plasma FVIII antigen levels of hemophilic mice from 3.9 ± 1.8 mU/ml to 32.7 ± 5.6 mU/ml (mean \pm SEM, n = 5) 3 days after implantation (P = 0.002 compared to control FVIIIdeficient mice) (Figure 5c). These levels significantly improved the bleeding phenotype. Control hemophilic mice implanted with naive CLECs had a mean blood loss of 797 \pm 89 mg in the tail-clip assay, whereas hemophilic mice implanted with unencapsulated or encapsulated CLECs stably integrated with FVIII cDNA lost 418 \pm 43 mg and 363 \pm 28 mg of blood (P = 0.03 and 0.001, respectively) compared to control FVIII-replete mice (Figure 5d).



Figure 2 High-resolution genome copy number analysis. (a) Genome-wide copy number profile of a mixed population of cord-lining epithelial cells (CLECs) stably integrated with pattBEGFP-C1 generated on Affymetrix Human Mapping 500K Array Set. Human chromosomes are shown on the horizontal axis. Log₂ ratios are on the vertical axis. Horizontal lines are normal copy number boundaries. Dotted vertical lines demarcate individual chromosomes. (b) Characteristics of copy number change loci. Effects on transcription (twofold or more difference compared to wild-type CLECs) of genes in a 1 Mb window centered on each copy number change locus is shown. *The number of consecutive probe sets for each copy number change locus.

DISCUSSION

Different cell types are being investigated in current attempts to develop ex vivo cell therapy. We describe here the isolation, culture, characterization, and utilization of a novel cell type that can be consistently and readily obtained in quantity from the amniotic membrane of umbilical cords. These cells were epithelioid and expressed some of the key markers of pluripotency. Other similarities to embryonic stem cells were their capacity for self-renewal and long-term propagation in culture. The ability to derive an estimated 6×10^9 cells from a single healthy cord⁵ even before expansion in culture indicates the feasibility of clinically relevant quantities of CLECs for cell therapy. These characteristics, coupled with their lack of tumorigenicity and ethically uncontroversial derivation, make CLECs a suitable cell type for therapeutic applications. CLECs augment the range of cord-derived cells beyond cord blood cells, and expand cell therapy to nonhematopoietic and nononcologic applications.

The risk of insertional mutagenesis leading to adverse events²⁸ following the use of integrating vectors is a serious and practical concern that limits enthusiasm for clinical gene therapy. We undertook this study to evaluate the possibility of using genemodified CLECs as potential bioimplants for safe and long-term secretion of FVIII in hemophilic patients for whom factor replacement therapy is unaffordable. The main objective of this study was to characterize and evaluate whether phiC31 integrase could adversely alter the genomic architecture of transgenic cells, and

thus incur unacceptable genotoxic and oncogenic risks. PhiC31 integrase has been shown to mediate site-directed integrations into an estimated 370 pseudo-attP sites in the human genome, although there is evidence for only a small subset of sites.¹⁵ In this study, we identified 44 independent integration events and confirm the previously reported conserved sequence motif¹⁵ at a majority of integration sites. Forty percent of recovered integrations occurred at 8p22, confirming the observations made when a therapeutic transgene, COL7A1, was integrated into human primary epidermal progenitor cells.²⁹ Our data suggest that the 8p22 integration site is likely to be safe as no chromosomal translocations were detected in >132 metaphases from five clonal populations bearing 8p22 integrations, and no changes were detected in the expression of genes that mapped within 1 Mb intervals centered around 8p22 integrations. This tendency to integrate at 8p22 could be accentuated by developing integrase variants of higher target site specificity^{30,31} and, if combined with clonal selection to further enhance the biosafety of these modified cells, could advance toward clinical applications.

One of the possible adverse effects of integrating vectors is dysregulation of the function of genes at or close to integration sites.^{23,24,28} We determined the influence of transgene integration on the transcriptome of phiC31 integrase–modified CLECs. The technique employed had a detection sensitivity of 1 transcript per 200,000 (ref. 32) and thus could accurately reflect the transcriptional changes in even a small proportion of transgenic CLECs. Our



Figure 3 Copy number of integration and spectral karyotype of phiC31 integrase-modified cord-lining epithelial cells (CLECs). (a) Normal spectral karyotype in 296 of 300 metaphases of integrase-modified CLECs (upper panel). Rare chromosomal translocations (lower panel), t(7:13) (p21:q22) and t(1:19) (q25, q13.3), were each observed in 1 of 300 metaphases. A third translocation, t(1:18) (q25, q12), was observed in 2 of 300 metaphases. (b) Frequency distribution of copy number of integrated transgene in CLECs determined by fluorescence *in situ* hybridization of a fluorescein-labeled vector-specific probe. Representative image of integrated transgene (green signals) in DAPI-stained interphase nuclei of CLECs. Original magnification ×1,000. Bar = 5 μ m.

analysis of transcriptome data with reference to retrieved integration events revealed no significant perturbations in the expression of genes close to integration sites or within 1 Mb intervals centered around these sites, with the single exception of *LNX1*, thus confirming the transcriptionally benign effects of these integrations. It is worth noting that even potential oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes in these regions showed no perturbation of expression.

Global transcriptome analysis did reveal that 1.3% of total expressed genes had significant changes in transgenic CLECs. A major biosafety concern of genome modification is the risk of mutating or dysregulating oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes.^{28,33} In our study, 15 of 151 transcriptionally altered genes were either potential oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes. Pathway mapping of these 151 transcriptionally altered genes identified only three genes that mapped significantly to a single pathway (p53 signaling; P = 0.02). The likelihood that transgenic CLECs were oncogenically transformed was judged to be low based on unaltered colony-forming activity *in vitro* and absence of tumor development in immunocompromised mice *in vivo*.

Previous reports have shown the association of phage integrasemediated integrations with deletions of up to a few thousand base pairs and insertions of up to a few hundred base pairs at integration sites.³⁴ In our study, however, DNA sequence analysis revealed microdeletions of vector DNA (\leq 37 bp) at recovered integration junctions. Using high-resolution genome copy number data of a mass culture of transgenic CLECs showed significant copy number changes (two deletions and one gain) in only three genomic regions that were not integration sites. The size of these genomic regions ranged from 17 to 37 kb. Only two genes (*PSRC1, SYPL2*) within 1 Mb windows centered around these genomic regions showed significant transcriptional changes (**Figure 2a,b**). Thus, no major deletions or insertions could be ascribed to phiC31 integrase-mediated transgene integrations, and the few copy number changes detected had minimal transcriptional effects of uncertain functional relevance.

Another major concern from studies of phiC31 integrase in human cells to date is the occurrence of chromosomal translocations in up to 15% of stably modified cell lines,³⁴ primary human embryonic and adult fibroblasts.^{21,22} However, our analysis of >300 spectral karyotypes of phage integrase–modified cells revealed only two cells with nonrecurring chromosomal translocations and two cells harboring the same translocation. These rearranged



Figure 4 Lack of tumorigenicity of phiC31 integrase–modified cordlining epithelial cells (CLECs) in SCID mice. Immunostaining with antihuman vimentin antibody shows renal subcapsular engraftment of CLECs (**a**) 1 month and (**b**) 3 months after implantation in SCID mice. (**c**) Engraftment of CLECs, 1 month after injection into nuchal subcutaneous region. Original magnification ×200. (**d**) Immunostaining of cultured CLECs from explants recovered from subcutaneous regions of mice 1 month after implantation. Original magnification ×100. Bar = 100 µm.

chromosomes were only detected in mass cultures of CLECs and none was found in eight clonal populations. The frequency of observed translocations in this study (4 of 300 metaphases) was lower compared to other reports (15-30%) and may be related, in part, to the different cell types used by other investigators for phiC31 integrase modification.^{21,22,34} Surveys of two large series of prenatal genetic screening have shown de novo chromosomal translocations in amniocytes, chorionic villus, and fetal blood samples. In one study, normal infants were born of pregnancies that were not terminated on the basis of abnormal karyotypes,²⁶ whereas in the other study, the risk of congenital malformations was sufficiently close to the background rate that it did not support a relationship of chromosomal rearrangements to somatic abnormalities.²⁷ Although both studies are limited with respect to accurate risk assessment, it remains true that at least some de novo chromosomal translocations are functionally silent and inconsequential.35 Our data are consistent with the proposition that translocations in phiC31 integrase-modified cells are uncommon stochastic events that do not confer either a survival or proliferative advantage to the affected cell(s). Had this not been the case, the translocations we identified in modified CLECs would have been the dominant karyotype in a mass culture, rather than the highly sporadic events actually observed.

Although translocations are a cause for concern, it is axiomatic that malignant transformation results from multiple, rather than single, genetic and genomic alterations.³⁶ Moreover, specific rather than random translocations are associated with hematologic and solid tissue malignancies in order.³⁷ Robust defenses against neoplastic transformation in the form of cell cycle arrest, apoptosis, and senescence are activated by the genotoxic stress of unrestrained cell proliferation induced by mutations and/or genomic aberrations.³⁸ Operation of these innate tumor suppressive mechanisms



Figure 5 Stable secretion of factor VIII by transfected CLECs in vitro and demonstration of FVIII bioactivity in vivo. (a) FVIII secretion in vitro by transgenic CLECs shows FVIII activity in the conditioned media of CLECs 3 (open bar) and 15 days (black bar) after transfection with patt-BhFer-FVIII. Control CLECs were transfected with pattBEGFP-C1. Data are mean \pm SEM, n = 3. (**b**) Durable *in vitro* secretion of FVIII by phiC31 integrase–modified CLECs. Data are mean \pm SEM, n = 2. (c) Plasma FVIII levels of hemophilic mice implanted subcutaneously with 8×10^6 stably integrated FVIII-secreting CLECs that were either unencapsulated or encapsulated with Matrigel. Control animals were implanted with Matrigel-encapsulated wild-type CLECs. Plasma FVIII antigen levels were measured using an ELISA technique specific for human FVIII. FVIII levels of treated hemophilic mice were significantly higher (P < 0.05) on days 1 (open bar) and 3 (black bar) compared to day 0 values (shaded bar). Data are mean \pm SEM; n = 5 per group. (d) Assessment of phenotype correction. The amount of blood loss from a tail clip was determined for FVIII-replete C57BL/6 mice, hemophilic mice implanted subcutaneously with Matrigel-encapsulated wild-type CLECs, hemophilic mice implanted with unencapsulated or Matrigel-encapsulated FVIII-secreting CLECs. Blood loss was significantly reduced in treated mice compared to control hemophilic animals. Data are mean \pm SEM; n = 5 per group.

probably explain the fact that mass cultures of phiC31-modified CLECs did not develop clonal dominance of cells harboring chromosomal translocations.

The benign safety profile of phiC31 integrase-modified CLECs suggested by *in vitro* analyses was confirmed by lack of *in vivo* tumorigenicity when these cells were implanted into immunocompromised mice. Careful autopsies performed 4 months later showed a complete absence of tumors, whereas transformed human cells typically form tumors within 3–6 weeks.³⁹ Immunohistochemical staining for human vimentin of implanted cells *in situ* and after reculturing from explants *in vitro*

showed that these cells were viable *in vivo* for at least 4 months but did not form tumors.

Implantation of FVIII-secreting CLECs raised plasma FVIII levels and partially corrected the bleeding phenotype in hemophilic mice, suggesting the potential for developing nongenotoxic cellular therapy that could be especially effective for autologous or allogeneic applications. Modest increase in plasma FVIII levels could be attributed to the known short circulating half-life of human FVIII in mice (74 minutes compared to 12 hours in humans)⁴⁰ and suboptimal engraftment and vascularization of implanted human cells in a xenogeneic host.

Although our data show that phage integrase–modified CLECs expanded as polyclonal mass cultures appear to have sustained few or no potentially oncogenic genomic alterations, this approach could be rendered even safer by implanting clonal populations prescreened *ex vivo* for biosafety using a range of assays such as those we employed. The use of integrases with greater specificity,^{30,31} high-throughput screening methods for selecting safe clones,⁴¹ and the high proliferation capacity of these cells could make this approach acceptable for clinical trials.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

CLEC isolation and characterization. Fresh umbilical cords from uncomplicated pregnancies were transported in L-15 medium supplemented with 50 IU/ml penicillin, 50 µg/ml streptomycin, 250 µg/ml Fungizone, and 50 µg/ml gentamicin (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) and processed in sterile conditions. Blood was removed by flushing the cannulated cord with phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) supplemented with 5 IU/ml heparin (Sigma-Aldrich, St Louis, MO). The cord was next cut into 2 cm segments, washed and disinfected with 70% ethanol and washed again with antibiotic-containing PBS. The amniotic membrane was dissected free from other cord contents, cut into 0.5 cm² squares and placed in a cell culture dish filled with 5 ml of Medium 171 (Cascade Biologics, Portland, OR). Explants were cultured at 37 °C/5% CO₂, with medium change every 3 days. Outgrowing cells were trypsinized (0.0125% trypsin/0.05% EDTA) and seeded at a density of 1×10^6 cells/dish in Medium 171 supplemented with 50 µg/ml insulin-like growth factor-1, 50 µg/ml platelet-derived growth factor-BB, $5\,\mu$ g/ml transforming growth factor- β 1, and $5\,\mu$ g/ml insulin (R&D Systems, Minneapolis, MN). Cells were subcultured at 70% confluency and expanded or cryopreserved.

Reverse transcription PCR. RNA extracted from CLECs and a human embryonic stem cell line (HUES) (RNeasy mini kit; Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) was treated with DNAse I (Fermentas, Hanover, MD), reverse transcribed (Superscript II; Invitrogen) and amplified using GoTaq qPCR master mix (Promega, Madison, WI) and the following PCR primers: Nanog (forward primer 5' TTCCTTCCTCCATGGATCTG 3'; reverse primer 5' TCTGCTGGAGGCTGAGGTAT 3'), Oct-4 (forward primer 5' GGTTCTATTTGGGAAGGTATTCAG 3'; reverse primer 5' GGTTT CTGCTTTGCATATCTC 3') and γ -actin (forward primer 5' ACCACTG GCATTGTCATGGACTCT 3'; reverse primer 5' ATCTTGATCTTCAT GGTGCTGGGC 3'). Amplified products were electrophoresed on 2% agarose gels, imaged and quantified by densitometry measurements using Gel Doc 2000 system (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA).

Western blot analysis. CLECs, HUES, and human primary dermal fibroblasts were lysed with M-PER mammalian protein extraction reagent (Pierce, Waltham, MA); 20–50 µg protein from each cell lysate was separated by 14% SDS-PAGE under reducing conditions, electroblotted onto nitrocellulose membrane (Bio-Rad Laboratories) and probed with specific antibodies against human Oct-4 and Nanog (sc-5279; Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Santa Cruz, CA and ab21624; Abcam, Cambridge, UK, respectively). Antibody binding was visualized by horseradish peroxidase-conjugated goat antimouse or goat anti-rabbit secondary antibodies (Promega and Santa Cruz Biotechnology, respectively) and a chemiluminescence-based photoblot system (Amersham Biosciences, Piscataway, NJ).

Indirect immunofluorescence staining. CLECs in culture dishes were fixed with 4% (vol/vol) paraformaldehyde for 20 minutes, washed with PBS before and after permeabilization with 0.1% Triton X-100, and incubated with monoclonal antibodies against keratins 18 and 19 (Dako, Glostrup, Denmark), pancytokeratin (AE1/AE3; Abcam), and desmoplakin.⁴² Visualization using fluorescein isothiocyanate-labeled secondary antibodies (Dako) was performed as previously described.⁴³

AttB plasmid constructs. B domain-deleted human FVIII cDNA was assembled by PCR amplification of the desired fragments from the full-length sequence in pSP64-F8 (American Type Culture Collection, Manassas, VA). A 3kb fragment encoding the A1 and A2 domains and a segment of the B domain was PCR amplified (forward primer 5' TGTAGCGCTAGCATGCAAATAG 3'; reverse primer 5' GAATAAGGC GATATCTTTAGTCAA 3') and ligated to a 2.1 kb fragment encoding part of the B domain, A3, C1 and C2 domains (forward primer 5' GCAAAGCC CGGGAGGACTGAA 3'; reverse primer 5' CAGTGGCTCGAGGTCAG TAGAGGT 3') cloned in pcDNA3.1 (Invitrogen) bearing the CMV promoter. The preceding primer sequences incorporated recognition sites for NheI, EcoRV, SmaI, and XhoI used in cloning. The B domain from amino acids 1,007 to 1,648 (NM 000132) was deleted in this construct.⁴⁴ F309S substitution in the A1 domain was performed by site-directed mutagenesis using mutagenic primers (forward 5' AGTTTCTACTGTCTTGTCATATCTCT 3'; reverse 5' AGAGATATGACAAGACAGTAGAAACT 3') and PfuTurbo DNA polymerase (Stratagene, La Jolla, CA) and $\mathit{DpnI.^{45}}$ We assembled pattBCMV-FVIII by ligating the attB sequence as a 300-bp fragment⁴⁶ upstream of the CMV promoter in pcDNA3.1. Lastly, the CMV promoter was excised with MunI and NheI, and replaced by the human ferritin light chain promoter amplified from pVitro2 (InvivoGen, San Diego, CA) (forward primer 5' GCAGGCCAATTGTAACTTACGG 3'; reverse primer 5' TCAGATCGCTAGCACGCCGGTGG 3') to yield the final construct, pattBhFer-FVIII.

pattBEGFP-C1 was derived by inserting the same attB fragment into the *Mlu*I site of pEGFP-C1 (Clontech Laboratories, Mountain View, CA).

Cell culture and electroporation. CLECs were co-transfected by electroporating 2×10^6 cells with $10 \mu g$ pattBhFer-FVIII or pattBEGFP-C1 and $1.5 \mu g$ of pCMV-Int⁴⁶ in 400 μ l RPMI 1640/10% FCS medium in a 0.4 cm cuvette. Electrotransfer was performed with a single pulse (55 ms, 165V) delivered by BTX ECM 830 electroporator (Genetronics, San Diego, CA). The percentage of GFP⁺ cells was determined by FACS analysis (BD FACSCalibur; Becton Dickinson, Mountain View, CA). Mixed population of stably integrated CLECs were selected by culture in medium containing 0.6 mg/ml G418 (Invitrogen) for 7 days. Clonal populations of EGFP-expressing CLECs were derived by expanding flow-sorted single cells in culture. Colony-forming assays were performed by low-density seeding of naive or a mixed population of stably integrated CLECs (200 cells/well; 6-well plate) followed by culture for 14 days, with medium change every third day. Cultures were stained with crystal violet (1% wt/vol, 30 minutes; BDH Chemicals, Poole, UK) and washed thrice with PBS.

Integration site retrieval and analysis. The percentage of stable integrants was determined by seeding FACS-sorted EGFP-expressing CLECs (2,000 and 5,000 cells) into 10 cm Petri dishes, followed by scoring the number of GFP⁺ cells/clones remaining after 7 days of selection with G418. Integration sites were recovered from pooled and mixed populations of stably transfected cells by the plasmid rescue method. Genomic DNA was isolated from transgenic CLECs using the Blood and Cell Culture Miniprep Kit (Qiagen). One microgram of genomic DNA was digested with a combination of either *SpeI*, *XbaI*, and *NheI*, or *Bam*HI and *BgI*II

restriction enzymes. Digested DNA was extracted with phenol-chloroform, precipitated in ethanol and ligated under dilute combinations using T4 DNA ligase. Ligated products were electroporated into DH10B *E. coli* (1.85 kV, 25 μ F, and 200 Ω ; Gene Pulser; Bio-Rad Laboratories) and plated on kanamycin LB-agar plates. All DNA modifying enzymes were from New England Biolabs (Ipswich, MA). Rescued plasmids were sequenced with the CHOSeqR primer (5'TCCCGTGCTCACCGTGACCAC3').¹⁵ DNA sequences were mapped to the reference human genome using the BLAT program (http://genome.ucsc.edu). Crossover junctions were identified by aligning retrieved sequences to the attB sequence. To determine whether the recovered integration sites shared a common motif, 100 bp of genomic DNA sequence flanking the crossover point of integration events in each cytoband was retrieved from the reference genome sequence and analyzed using the motif search program MEME (http://meme.nbcr.net).

Transcriptome and genome copy number profiling. Total RNA from naive and transgenic CLECs (RNeasy Mini Kit; Qiagen) served as starting material for transcript profiling on Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0 Arrays (Affymetrix, Santa Carla, CA) following the recommended protocols. Transcription expression data were analyzed using GeneChip Operating Software (Affymetrix). Transcripts whose expression levels in transgenic CLECs were significantly altered as determined by the operating software using Wilcoxon signed-rank test and differed more than twofold compared to naive CLECs were selected for analysis using DAVID (Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery) 2.1 Functional Annotation Tool (http://david.abcc.ncifcrf.gov). These genes were referenced to a compilation of known proto-oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes⁴⁷ (http://microb230.med.upenn.edu/protocols/cancergenes.html).

High-resolution copy number profiling was performed on genomic DNA of naive and transgenic CLECs using the Human Mapping 500K Array Set (Affymetrix) and the data analyzed using GeneChip Chromosome Copy Number Analysis Tool. Regions of copy number gain or loss were defined as having \geq 3 consecutive SNPs concordant for significant copy number abnormalities. Log₂ signal intensity ratios >0.3 and <-0.3 were criteria for significant copy number gain and loss, respectively.

Spectral karyotyping and fluorescence in situ *hybridization*. Metaphase spreads of naive and transgenic CLECs were prepared by standard cytogenetic techniques. Spectral karyotyping according to the recommended protocol was performed using chromosome painting probes (Applied Spectral Imaging, Edingen-Neckarhausen, Germany) visualized with an Olympus BX61 epifluorescence microscope (Olympus, Tokyo, Japan) and SkyView ver. 2.1.1 (Applied Spectral Imaging). Fluorescence *in situ* hybridization was performed on interphase nuclei of naive and transgenic CLECs with an 800 bp probe derived from pattBEGFP-C1. The probe was labeled with fluorescein-12-dUTP (PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA) and the BioPrime DNA Labeling System (Invitrogen). Hybridization and DAPI counterstaining were performed according to standard protocols.⁴⁸

FVIII and blood loss assays. FVIII activity in culture supernatants of transfected CLECs was assayed using the Coatest SP FVIII kit (Chromogenix, Mölndal, Sweden) and the recommended protocol. Human-specific FVIII levels were quantitated in citrated mouse plasma using an ELISA kit (Affinity Biologicals, Ancaster, Ontario, Canada). Assessment of phenotypic correction was performed by determining the volume of blood loss in exon 16-disrupted FVIII knockout mice (kind gift of H.H. Kazazian, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA).^{49,50} The tail was warmed to 37 °C for 2 minutes, then severed 2 cm from the tip with a sharp blade and immediately placed in a microfuge tube containing 0.5 ml PBS at 37 °C for 15 minutes when bleeding was arrested by cauterization. The difference in the weight of the tube before and after blood collection quantified blood loss.

Animal work. Experimental protocols were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the Singapore General Hospital. Mice were housed at 27 °C in 12-h light:dark cycles. SCID mice were purchased

from Animal Resources Centre, Murdoch, Australia. All procedures were performed under anesthesia induced by intraperitoneal injection of 0.1 ml of a mixture consisting of equal parts of Hypnorm [fluanisone (10 mg/ml) and fentanyl citrate (0.315 mg/ml); Janssen Pharmaceutica, Berchem, Belgium] and Dormicum (midazolam, 5 mg/ml; Roche, Basel, Switzerland), diluted in two parts water. The tumorigenic potential of transgenic CLECs was assessed in SCID mice by subcutaneous nuchal or renal subcapsular implantation of 5×10^6 cells suspended in $50 \,\mu$ l PBS. Mice were visually inspected weekly for the appearance of subcutaneous tumors for 4 months, and killed after 1 and 3 months to check for renal subcapsular tumors. Phenotypic correction was evaluated by implanting 8×10^6 FVIII-secreting CLECs in 300 µl PBS mixed with 300 µl Matrigel (BD Biosciences, San Jose, CA) into the subcutaneous nuchal region of hemophilic male mice. Blood samples for FVIII assays were collected before, 1, 3, 6, and 15 days after cellular implantation. Blood was obtained by puncturing the retro-orbital venous plexus with heparinized capillary tubes and collected in 0.1 volume of 0.1 mol/l sodium citrate. Plasma was obtained by centrifugation at 20,000g and 4 °C for 10 minutes.

Histology. Five-micron paraffin sections of tissues removed from CLECs implantation sites were immunostained with antihuman vimentin antibodies (clone V9; Zymed, San Francisco, CA) followed by visualization using the REAL EnVision kit (Dako) and hematoxylin counterstain.

Statistical analysis. Analysis of variance and the Tukey–Kramer test were used for three or more groups and Student's unpaired *t*-test for two groups. Fisher's exact test with two-sided *P* value was used to determine statistical significance between two proportions. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Figure S1. Site specificity of phiC31 integrase–mediated transgene integration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by a research grant from SingHealth Foundation (SHF/FG347P/2006) to O.L.K. We thank Michele P. Calos (Stanford University, Stanford, CA) for gifts of pTA-attb and pCMV-Int, and for advice on plasmid rescue of integration sites; Mark Richards (Nanyang Polytechnic, Singapore) for the gift of HUES cells; Leonard Ang (Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore) and Jill Allen (Department of Dermatology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK) for gifts of antikeratin and antidesmoplakin antibodies, respectively; Mickey Koh, Tsyr Jong Lim, and Madelaine Niam (Health Sciences Authority, Singapore) for cell sorting; and Siew Hong Leong (National Cancer Center, Singapore) for assistance with spectral karyotyping. T.T.P., whose cells were studied in the present work, has a financial interest in CellResearch Corporation.

REFERENCES

- Weiss, ML and Troyer, DL (2006). Stem cells in the umbilical cord. Stem Cell Rev 2: 155–162.
- Harris, DT and Rogers, I (2007). Umbilical cord blood: a unique source of pluripotent stem cells for regenerative medicine. *Curr Stem Cell Res Ther* 2: 301–309.
- Miki, T and Strom, SC (2006). Amnion-derived pluripotent/multipotent stem cells. Stem Cell Rev 2: 133–142.
- Ruetze, M, Gallinat, S, Lim, IJ, Chow, E, Phan, TT, Staeb, F et al. (2008). Common features of umbilical cord epithelial cells and epidermal keratinocytes. J Dermatol Sci 50: 227–231.
- Phan, TT and Lim, IJ. Isolation of stem/progenitor cells from amniotic membrane of umbilical cord. UK Patent No. GB 2432166, granted 2 January 2008.
- Matikainen, T and Laine, J (2005). Placenta–an alternative source of stem cells. Toxicol Appl Pharmacol 207 (2 suppl.): 544–549.
- Kurtzberg, J (2009). Update on umbilical cord blood transplantation. Curr Opin Pediatr 21: 22–29.
- Secco, M, Zucconi, E, Vieira, NM, Fogaça, LL, Cerqueira, A, Carvalho, MD et al. (2008). Multipotent stem cells from umbilical cord: cord is richer than blood! Stem Cells 26: 146–150.
- Kermani, AJ, Fathi, F and Mowla, SJ (2008). Characterization and genetic manipulation of human umbilical cord vein mesenchymal stem cells: potential application in cell-based gene therapy. *Rejuvenation Res* 11: 379–386.

- Can, A and Karahuseyinoglu, S (2007). Concise review: human umbilical cord stroma with regard to the source of fetus-derived stem cells. *Stem Cells* 25: 2886–2895.
- Pfeifer, A and Verma, IM (2001). Gene therapy: promises and problems. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet 2: 177–211.
- Hacein-Bey-Abina, S, Garrigue, A, Wang, GP, Soulier, J, Lim, A, Morillon, E et al. (2008). Insertional oncogenesis in 4 patients after retrovirus-mediated gene therapy of SCID-X1. J Clin Invest 118: 3132–3142.
- Ott, MG, Schmidt, M, Schwarzwaelder, K, Stein, S, Siler, U, Koehl, U et al. (2006). Correction of X-linked chronic granulomatous disease by gene therapy, augmented by insertional activation of MDS1-EV11, PRDM16 or SETBP1. Nat Med 12: 401–409.
 Kohn, DB (2008). Gene therapy for childhood immunological diseases. Bone Marrow
- Kohn, DB (2008). Gene therapy for childhood immunological diseases. *Bone Marrow Transplant* **41**: 199–205.
 Chalberg, TW, Portlock, JL, Olivares, EC, Thyagarajan, B, Kirby, PJ, Hillman, RT *et al.*
- (2006). Integration specificity of phage phiC31 integrase in the human genome. *J Mol Biol* 357: 28–48.
 Held, PK, Olivares, EC, Aguilar, CP, Finegold, M, Calos, MP and Grompe, M (2005).
- In vivo correction of murine hereditary tyrosinemia type I by phiC31 integrasemediated gene delivery. *Mol Ther* **11**: 399–408.
 Bertoni, C, Jarrahian, S, Wheeler, TM, Li, Y, Olivares, EC, Calos, MP et al. (2006).
- Bertoni, C, Jarrahian, S, Wheeler, TM, Li, Y, Olivares, EC, Calos, MP et al. (2006). Enhancement of plasmid-mediated gene therapy for muscular dystrophy by directed plasmid integration. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 103: 419–424.
- 18. Calos, MP (2006). The phiC31 integrase system for gene therapy. *Curr Gene Ther* **6**: 633–645.
- Thyagarajan, B, Liu, Y, Shin, S, Lakshmipathy, U, Scheyhing, K, Xue, H et al. (2008). Creation of engineered human embryonic stem cell lines using phiC31 integrase. Stem Cells 26: 119–126.
- Ehrhardt, A, Xu, H, Huang, Z, Engler, JA and Kay, MA (2005). A direct comparison of two nonviral gene therapy vectors for somatic integration: *in vivo* evaluation of the bacteriophage integrase phiC31 and the Sleeping Beauty transposase. *Mol Ther* 11: 695–706.
- Liu, J, Jeppesen, I, Nielsen, K and Jensen, TG (2006). Phi c31 integrase induces chromosomal aberrations in primary human fibroblasts. *Gene Ther* 13: 1188–1190.
- Liu, J, Skjørringe, T, Gjetting, T and Jensen, TG (2009). PhiC31 integrase induces a DNA damage response and chromosomal rearrangements in human adult fibroblasts. *BMC Biotechnol* 9: 31.
- 23. Wu, X, Li, Y, Crise, B and Burgess, SM (2003). Transcription start regions in the human genome are favored targets for MLV integration. *Science* **300**: 1749–1751.
- Recchia, A, Bonini, C, Magnani, Z, Urbinati, F, Sartori, D, Muraro, S et al. (2006). Retroviral vector integration deregulates gene expression but has no consequence on the biology and function of transplanted T cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 103: 1457–1462.
- Kallioniemi, A (2008). CGH microarrays and cancer. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* **19**: 36–40.
 Giardino, D, Corti, C, Ballarati, L, Colombo, D, Sala, E, Villa, N *et al.* (2009). De novo
- balanced chromosome rearrangements in prenatal diagnosis. *Prenat Diagn* **29**: 257–265.
- Warburton, D (1991). De novo balanced chromosome rearrangements and extra marker chromosomes identified at prenatal diagnosis: clinical significance and distribution of breakpoints. *Am J Hum Genet* **49**: 995–1013.
- Hacein-Bey-Abina, S, Von Kalle, C, Schmidt, M, McCormack, MP, Wulffraat, N, Leboulch, P *et al.* (2003). LMO2-associated clonal T cell proliferation in two patients after gene therapy for SCID-X1. *Science* **302**: 415–419.
- Ortiz-Urda, S, Thyagarajan, B, Keene, DR, Lin, Q, Fang, M, Calos, MP et al. (2002). Stable nonviral genetic correction of inherited human skin disease. Nat Med 8: 1166–1170.
- Sclimenti, CR, Thyagarajan, B and Calos, MP (2001). Directed evolution of a recombinase for improved genomic integration at a native human sequence. *Nucleic Acids Res* 29: 5044–5051.

- Keravala, A, Lee, S, Thyagarajan, B, Olivares, EC, Gabrovsky, VE, Woodard, LE *et al.* (2009). Mutational derivatives of PhiC31 integrase with increased efficiency and specificity. *Mol Ther* 17: 112–120.
- Affymetrix, Inc. Design and performance of the genechip human genome U133 plus 2.0 and human genome U133A 2.0 arrays. Technical note. http://www.affymetrix.com/support/technical/technote/hgu133_p2_technotes.pdf>. Accessed 15 September 2009.
- Futreal, PA, Coin, L, Marshall, M, Down, T, Hubbard, T, Wooster, R et al. (2004). A census of human cancer genes. Nat Rev Cancer 4: 177–183.
- Ehrhardt, A, Engler, JA, Xu, H, Cherry, AM and Kay, MA (2006). Molecular analysis of chromosomal rearrangements in mammalian cells after phiC31-mediated integration. *Hum Gene Ther* 17: 1077–1094.
- Varella-Garcia, M, Chen, L, Powell, RL, Hirsch, FR, Kennedy, TC, Keith, R et al. (2007). Spectral karyotyping detects chromosome damage in bronchial cells of smokers and patients with cancer. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 176: 505–512.
- Hahn, WC and Weinberg, RA (2002). Rules for making human tumor cells. N Engl J Med 347: 1593–1603.
- Mitelman, F, Johansson, B and Mertens, F (2004). Fusion genes and rearranged genes as a linear function of chromosome aberrations in cancer. *Nat Genet* 36: 331–334.
- Lowe, SW, Cepero, E and Evan, G (2004). Intrinsic tumour suppression. Nature 432: 307–315.
 Mahala AM, Khan ZA, Jasrachi M, Nanjangud, CL, Ojao, BF, Yao, S, et al. (2009)
- Mahale, AM, Khan, ZA, Igarashi, M, Nanjangud, GJ, Qiao, RF, Yao, S et al. (2008). Clonal selection in malignant transformation of human fibroblasts transduced with defined cellular oncogenes. Cancer Res 68: 1417–1426.
- Dwarki, VJ, Belloni, P, Nijjar, T, Smith, J, Couto, L, Rabier, M et al. (1995). Gene therapy for hemophilia A: production of therapeutic levels of human factor VIII in vivo in mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 92: 1023–1027.
- Larcher, F, Dellambra, E, Rico, L, Bondanza, S, Murillas, R, Cattoglio, C et al. (2007). Long-term engraftment of single genetically modified human epidermal holoclones enables safety pre-assessment of cutaneous gene therapy. *Mol Ther* 15: 1670–1676.
- Parrish, EP, Steart, PV, Garrod, DR and Weller, RO (1987). Antidesmosomal monoclonal antibody in the diagnosis of intracranial tumours. J Pathol 153: 265–273.
- Allen, J, Phan, TT, Hughes, MA, Cherry, GW and Wojnarowska, F (2003). The cellular origins of the linear IgA disease target antigens: an indirect immunofluorescence study using cultured human keratinocytes and fibroblasts. Br J Dermatol 148: 945–953.
- Miao, HZ, Sirachainan, N, Palmer, L, Kucab, P, Cunningham, MA, Kaufman, RJ *et al.* (2004). Bioengineering of coagulation factor VIII for improved secretion. *Blood* **103**: 3412–3419.
- Swaroop, M, Moussalli, M, Pipe, SW and Kaufman, RJ (1997). Mutagenesis of a potential immunoglobulin-binding protein-binding site enhances secretion of coagulation factor VIII. J Biol Chem 272: 24121–24124.
- Groth, AC, Olivares, EC, Thyagarajan, B and Calos, MP (2000). A phage integrase directs efficient site-specific integration in human cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 97: 5995–6000.
- Wang, GP, Garrigue, A, Ciuffi, A, Ronen, K, Leipzig, J, Berry, C et al. (2008). DNA bar coding and pyrosequencing to analyze adverse events in therapeutic gene transfer. *Nucleic Acids Res* 36: e49.
- 48. Knoll, JH, Lichter, P, Bakdounes, K and Eltoum, IE (2007). *In situ* hybridization and detection using nonisotopic probes. *Curr Protoc Mol Biol* Chapter 14: Unit 14.7.
- Bi, L, Lawler, AM, Antonarakis, SE, High, KA, Gearhart, JD and Kazazian, HH Jr (1995). Targeted disruption of the mouse factor VIII gene produces a model of haemophilia A. Nat Genet 10: 119–121.
- Rawle, FE and Lillicrap, D (2004). Preclinical animal models for hemophilia gene therapy: predictive value and limitations. *Semin Thromb Hemost* 30: 205–213.