Epigenetic mechanisms of gene expression regulation in neurological diseases
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Neurological diseases are a heterogenous group of disorders caused by alterations in nervous system function. The genetic background of neurological diseases is heterogenous and may include chromosomal aberrations, specific gene mutations and epigenetic defects. This review is aimed at presenting of selected diseases that are associated with different epigenetic alterations. The imprinting defects on chromosome 15 are the cause of Prader-Willi and Angelman syndromes that both are characterized by intellectual disability, developmental delay and specific behavioral phenotype. Besides the imprinting defect, these diseases can also be caused by deletion of chromosome 15 or uniparental disomy. Aberrant epigenetic regulation is also specific for Fragile X syndrome that is caused by expansion of CGG repeats in the FMR1 gene that leads to global methylation of the promoter region and repression of FMR1 transcription. A number of neurological diseases, mainly associated with intellectual impairment, may be caused by mutations in genes encoding proteins involved in epigenetic regulation. The number of such diseases is rapidly growing thanks to the implementation of genomic sequencing for the identification of their molecular causes. One of the best known diseases linked to defects in epigenetic modifiers is Rett syndrome caused by a mutation in the MECP2 gene or its variant – Rett-like syndrome caused by a mutation in CDKL5 or FOXG1 genes. As the epigenetic signature is potentially reversible, much attention is focused on possible therapies with drugs that influence DNA or histone modifications. This is especially important in the case of neurological disorders in which epigenetic changes are observed as the effect of the disease.
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INTRODUCTION

Neurological diseases are a heterogenous group of disorders caused by alterations in nervous system function. The causes of these diseases are various and include genetic causes, congenital abnormalities, injuries of brain, spinal cord or specific nerves, infections or other environmental factors. Also the spectrum of clinical phenotypes of patients is wide depending on the observed abnormalities of the central or peripheral nervous system.

There is a growing evidence that genetic factors strongly influence the etiology of neurological diseases. The genetic background of neurological diseases is heterogenous and may include chromosomal aberrations (e.g. aneuploidies, deletion or duplication of specific chromosome regions) and gene mutations. Epigenetic regulation is known to alter gene expression in a heritable manner that is not due to changes in DNA sequence. Specific mechanisms are responsible for the regulation of the level of transcription or translation (Feinberg 2008). The most commonly examined mechanism that regulates gene expression is DNA methylation – a covalent modification of cytosine most commonly located in so-called “CpG islands”. These islands are characteristic for promoter regions of genes, where methylation represses gene expression. There are several enzymes that are responsible for DNA methylation establishment, the so-called “DNA methyltransferases”, DNMT3 is responsible for de novo DNA methylation, while DNMT1 is responsible for the methylation of hemimethylated DNA during the replication process (Razin and Kantor 2005). DNA methylation is not only respon-
sible for gene expression silencing, but also is important for global chromosome X inactivation and genomic imprinting. Moreover, methylation is specific for repetitive sequences, transposons and endogenous retroviruses that might prevent their mobility in the genome. DNA methylation indirectly regulates the chromatin structure and its accessibility for transcription factors. The DNA methylation mark is a sign for methyl-binding proteins for binding and recruitment of other proteins forming a repression complex. As a consequence the chromatin becomes more densely packed, cannot be accessed by transcription factors and gene expression is silenced (Portela and Esteller 2010).

The second mechanism that is involved in gene expression regulation are covalent modifications of the histone proteins forming the core of nucleosomes. The N-terminal ends of these proteins, especially of histone 3 and 4, undergo modifications such as: methylation, acetylation, phosphorylation, ubiquitination and others. The character of the modification and its localization is responsible for the effect which it exerts on gene expression. Acetylation and deacetylation, catalyzed by histone acetyltransferases (HAT) and histone deactylases (HDAC) are responsible for expression activation and repression, respectively (Portela and Esteller 2010). Histone methylation can have both an activating and an inhibiting effect that depends on the localization of the lysine that is covalently modified. For example, the methylation of lysine 4 and lysine 36 in histone 3 (H3K4, H3K36) was found to be associated with open chromatin structure and activation of gene expression. In contrast, methylation of lysine 9 and 27 in histone 3 is associated with silencing of mRNA transcription. The methylation of histone proteins is catalyzed by histone methyltransferases and histone demethylases (Lennartsson and Ekwall 2009, Nimura et al. 2010). Modifications of histone proteins directly influence chromatin structure, for example, acetylation and deacetylation are responsible for chromatin decondensation and compaction, respectively. They are also responsible for the interaction between chromatin and transcription factors and forming of transcriptional complexes (Lennartsson and Ekwall 2009).

DNA methylation and histone modifications are not separate mechanisms that have an impact on gene expression, they act together to influence the chromatin structure. The transcriptionally silent chromatin structure is associated with DNA methylation, histone deacetylation and methylation of specific lysines in H3 and H4. In contrast, DNA methylation is not observed when the chromatin structure is open, while the histones are acetylated and methylated on specific positions (Ikegami et al. 2009, Portela and Esteller 2010).

Another mechanism that is involved in epigenetic regulation of gene expression is the mechanism driven by non-coding RNA. This mechanism acts on the RNA level and regulates gene expression posttranscriptionally by specific interaction between target RNA and so-called interference RNA. This interaction leads to the recruitment of specific protein complexes that are responsible for the target RNA degradation and decreasing the level of specific proteins. The detailed description of the mechanisms of action of non-coding RNA can be found elsewhere (Bicker and Schratt 2008, Bian and Sun 2011, Qureshi and Mehler 2012).

The alterations of epigenetic regulation are frequently observed in case of common diseases like cancer, that affect mainly elderly populations (Miremadi et al. 2007). However, the defects of epigenetic regulation can also be found in the case of inherited diseases. Epigenetic alterations might be the direct cause of the disease, may also be observed as the effect associated with a specific disease. For the purpose of this review we have divided neurological diseases into three groups: neurological diseases that are associated with improper epigenetic (methylation) pattern, neurological diseases associated with mutations in specific genes that encode proteins responsible for proper epigenetic regulation and neurological diseases in which the epigenetic changes are an effect of the specific disease (Urdinguio et al. 2009).

As the listing of all the diseases that are caused by improper epigenetic regulation is not the aim of this review, the selected diseases that are investigated at the Department of Medical Genetics of the Institute of Mother and Child are discussed. Other diseases related to gene expression alterations like, e.g., immunodeficiency, centromeric instability and facial anomalies (ICF), Coffin-Lowry, Rubinstein-Taybi and X-linked α-thalassemia/mental retardation syndromes have been widely described in the literature (e.g., Ausio et al. 2003). Also the epigenetic changes found in neurodegenerative diseases have been reviewed in Urdinguio and coauthors (2009).
IMPROPER EPIGENETIC PATTERN

The first group of neurological diseases that are associated with improper gene expression regulation includes genetic disorders that are associated with alterations of the methylation pattern in specific chromosomal regions. The methylation pattern can be changed due to an imprinting defect or the presence of a specific mutation.

Imprinting defects

Normally, autosomal genes are expressed from both alleles and if one of them is silent this might lead to haploinsufficiency, lower expression of the specific gene cause a disease. This is clearly seen in case of chromosome monosomies that are lethal and the fetuses carrying this defect die in utero (the rare exception is X chromosome monosomy – 45,X – that is a cause of Turner syndrome) or dominant diseases, in which the presence of a mutation in one allele results in a specific clinical phenotype. However, in the genome, there are specific regions that contain genes whose expression is regulated by their parental inheritance, that are specifically expressed only from the paternal or maternal allele (Isles and Wilkinson 2000). This expression is regulated by epigenetic marks, the so-called genomic imprinting, specifically DNA methylation and histone modifications that are established on the chromosomes depending on their parental origin. The genomic imprinting is established in the germ cell line after the erasure of existing epigenetic marks, is parent-specific and stably passed during divisions of the zygote after fertilization and through the lifespan (Kinoshita et al. 2008).

In humans, about 60 genes that were found to be imprinted, although it was suggested that there can be up to 1 000. The imprinted genes are localized on chromosomes 6, 7, 11, 14 and 15 and are organized into clusters. The regulation of gene expression in these clusters is not restricted to single genes, there is a special regulatory center called the imprinting center (IC). The imprinting center regulates the parent-specific expression of genes localized in the cluster. The presence of genomic imprinting makes the maternal and paternal genomes not equivalent and was suggested to be the mechanism that prevents parthenogenesis (Kinoshita et al. 2008).

The defects of genomic imprinting are very rare, but if they occur in germ line cells that undergo fertilization, it is impossible to repair them. Usually the imprinting defect affects only one cluster of genes, but recently published data suggest that global demethylation and deregulation of gene expression in several clusters can also occur. Improper imprinting can be caused by defects in imprinting erasure or establishment in germ line cells as well as by defects of imprinting maintenance during the cell divisions. The latter, leads to the occurrence of mosaicism – a state where the defect is present only in a fraction of cells, while the others are normal (Horsthemke 2010).

The imprinting defect can be the effect of primary epimutation, when the improper imprinting is observed but no changes in DNA sequence are detected. This is the cause of the majority of imprinting defects and can be associated with the presence of specific haplotypes (e.g., AS-H3 haplotype in Angelman syndrome). The defects can be also caused by secondary epimutation, when the mutation in DNA leads to improper epigenetic signature establishment. The mutation can be a cis-acting mutation, like the defects in the imprinting regulatory center (deletions in PWS-IC in Prader-Willi syndrome), or trans-acting, when the mutation is present in genes coding for imprinting regulatory factors (e.g. mutations in NLRP2 in familial cases of Beckwith-Wiedeman syndrome) (Horsthemke and Wagstaff 2008, Horsthemke 2010).

The imprinting defect is the cause of improper gene expression. The gene whose expression from a specific allele should be silenced is expressed, while the gene that should be expressed might be repressed by an improper epigenetic mark. These result in improper gene dosage and can be the cause of alterations in organism growth and development (especially the development of the nervous system, Smith et al. 2006, Butler 2009). Similar effects can be observed when deletion of imprinted region, uniparental disomy of a specific chromosome, translocations involving chromosomes with an imprinted region or mutations in imprinted genes are present (Yamazawa et al. 2010).

Prader-Willi and Angelman syndromes (PWS, AS)

Chromosomal aberrations affecting imprinted genes or specific imprinting defects might result in so-called imprinting diseases (Table I), among which Angelman and Prader-Willi syndromes are the ones that have neurological character. Patients affected with these diseases display developmental delay, especially delay of motor skills and speech, and intellectual disability (Dagli and Williams 2011, Driscoll et al. 2012).
Moreover, in Prader-Willi patients, in the perinatal period hypotonia and failure to thrive due to problems with breast feeding are observed. Later in life, due to improper pituitary-hypothalamic axis function, growth hormone deficiency is found in over 85% patients. The hypothalamic dysfunction also results in lack of satiety, hyperfagia and excessive obesity if the food intake is not controlled. In males, hypogonadism is also frequently observed (Jin 2012). Patients with Angelman syndrome, besides severe psychomotor delay and problems with speech, display ataxia of gait and a specific behavioral phenotype (happy phenotype with frequent laughing and excitability). The frequent finding in AS patients is also microcephaly, seizures, an abnormal, specific EEG pattern and hypopigmentation (Tan et al. 2011, Williams C.A. et al. 2010).

Both these diseases are caused by an imprinting defect on chromosome 15 in the q11-q13 region (Chamberlain and Lalande 2010b). This region contains several genes whose expression is controlled by a bipartite (AS/PWS-IC) imprinting center (Kantor et al. 2006). The NDN1, MKRN3, C15orf2 (NPAP1), MAGEL2 genes, SNURF-SNRPN transcript, that is alternatively spliced and encodes SNURF protein and SmN protein involved in mRNA splicing in the brain, and C/D box small nucleolar RNA genes, are specifically expressed from the paternal chromosome (Neumann et al. 2012). On the maternal one, they are methylated and specific expression of UBE3A and ATP10A takes place. Other genes that are located in this region are expressed from both maternal and paternal chromosomes (Horsthemke and Buiting 2006).

Angelman syndrome is caused by the lack of maternal contribution in the 15q11-1q13 region. It can be caused by the presence of a large deletion on the maternal chromosome (65–75% of cases), paternal uniparental disomy of chromosome 15 (3–7%) or an imprinting defect that results in the presence of the paternal imprint on both chromosomes (3%). The disease can be also caused by mutations in UBE3A gene (5–11% of cases) that seems to be crucial in the AS pathogenesis (Dagli and Williams 2011). The UBE3A gene displays tissue specific imprinting – it is specifically expressed in the brain from the maternal allele (Chamberlain and Lalande 2010a). It encodes the E6AP ubiquitin protein ligase that is responsible for ubiquitination of proteins and targeting them for degradation in proteasomes (Dindot et al. 2008). The mouse model, lacking Ube3a from the maternal chromosomes, display specific Parkinson-like seizures and abnormal dopamine neurotransmission, whose proper function can be restored with L-DOPA treatment (Riday et al. 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Important genes in the region</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prader-Willi syndrome</td>
<td>15q11-q13</td>
<td>HBII-85</td>
<td>1/10 000–25 000</td>
<td>Buiting 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelman syndrome</td>
<td>15q11-q13</td>
<td>UBE3A</td>
<td>1/12 000–20 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith-Wiedemann syndrome</td>
<td>11p15.5</td>
<td>H19, IGF2, KCNQ1OT1, CDKN1C</td>
<td>1/15 000</td>
<td>Choufani et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver-Russell syndrome</td>
<td>11p15.5, 7p11.2-p13</td>
<td>H19, IGF2, GRB10, MEST</td>
<td>1/3 000–100 000</td>
<td>Eggermann 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient neonatal diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>6q24</td>
<td>PLAG1, HYMAI</td>
<td>1/400 000</td>
<td>MacKay and Temple 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudohypoparathyroidism lb</td>
<td>20q13.11</td>
<td>GNAS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Kelsey 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. The chromosomal organization of the 15q11-q13 region (A) involved in Prader-Willi and Angelman syndromes and examples of tests used in the molecular diagnosis of these diseases (B). (A) Each rectangle represents a single gene; grey – non-imprinted genes, black – imprinted genes expressed specifically from paternal (upper panel) or maternal (lower panel) chromosome, white – imprinted genes that are specifically silenced on the paternal or maternal chromosome; the methylated (silenced) genes on the maternal chromosome were marked with the star. The bipartite imprinting center (IC) is shown is grey. (B) The confirmation of clinical diagnosis of PWS and AS syndrome can be done by methylation-specific PCR (MS-PCR) that identifies maternal (methylated) and paternal (non-methylated) chromosomes. For the assessment of relative risk, it is necessary to further characterize the defect that is the cause of improper methylation pattern. This can be performed by Multiplex Ligation Dependent Probe Amplification (MLPA) technique that allows for the identification of deletion or imprinting center deletion. If the deletion is not identified, microsatellite analysis in proband and its parents can be performed to test for possible uniparental disomy (UPD). The biparental inheritance and lack of deletion suggests that other factors are responsible for the presence of improper imprinting.
In contrast to AS, Prader-Willi syndrome is caused by the lack of the paternal contribution in the 15q11-q13 region that can be the result of a paternal chromosome 15 deletion (65–75% of cases), maternal uniparental disomy (20–30%) or an imprinting defect that results in the presence of methylation on the paternal chromosome (2.5%) (Driscoll et al. 2012). Until recently, the specific gene that was specifically linked to PWS pathogenesis had not been identified although genes in the 15q11-q13 region encode proteins expressed in the nervous system. In 2008, a patient with a PWS-like phenotype was described. The patient displayed hyperphagia and severe obesity, mild learning difficulties and hypogonadism and in cytogenetic studies was found to carry a small microdeletion on chromosome 15 that encompassed only the HBII-85 gene (Sahoo et al. 2008). This gene encodes small nucleolar RNA (snoRNA) that is specifically expressed during neuronal differentiation and in mature neurons in the cortex and hypothalamus, especially in the regions that control food intake and energy balance (Zhang et al. 2012). In the case of Prader-Willi patients, the early diagnosis is crucial as the treatment with growth hormone is very effective when started in early childhood (Jin 2012).

**Fragile X syndrome**

The fragile X syndrome (FXS, FraX) is another disease in which an improper epigenetic mark on the DNA is observed. This disorder is one of the most common causes of genetically caused intellectual disability. Patients suffering from this disease, besides intellectual impairment, also were found to have delayed speech and psychomotor development, specific facial dysmorphism (long face, large, protruding ears), psychological disturbances (hyperreactivity, ADHD, autism spectrum behaviors) and macroorchidism. Mainly males are affected with FXS and its frequency is estimated at 1/4 000. In women (frequency of 1/8 000) less severe clinical features are observed and the clinical expression depends on the ratio of inactivation of the X chromosome with the mutation (Garber et al. 2008, Saul and Tarleton 2012).

The fragile X syndrome is caused by a mutation in the **FMR1** gene located on the X chromosome. The **FMR1** gene encodes FMRP – an RNA interacting protein that is responsible for mRNA transport from the nucleus to dendrites and regulation of protein synthesis at synapses via interaction with polyribosomes (Pfeiffer and Huber 2009). One of the processes that is regulated by the FMRP protein, is the regulation of the AMPA receptor internalization after mGluR activation with glutamate that is important for the learning process and memory formation (reviewed in: Rzońca and Gos 2012).

In the 5’ untranslated region of the **FMR1** gene, there is a CGG repeat sequence that is highly polymorphic and unstable. On average there are 30 CGG repeats in this region, but in patients with FXS the number of repeats exceeds 200 (Willemsen et al. 2011). The abundance of cytosine and guanine nucleotides results in the global methylation of the repeat region and neighboring regulatory elements. This leads to the repression of **FMR1** gene expression and lack of the protein (Oostra and Willemsen 2009, Godler et al. 2010). The insufficient level of FMRP protein results in excess of AMPA internalization, altered cell morphology and therefore inappropriate neuron functioning. It was shown on the mouse model without the **Fmr1** gene that the administration of antagonists of mGluR5 signaling (e.g. fenobam or MPEP) lowered the level of AMPA internalization and rescued the proper neuron morphology and wild-type phenotype in knock-out mice (Levenga et al. 2010, Willemsen et al. 2011, Vinueza Veloz et al. 2012).

**Chromosome X skewing**

X-linked intellectual disability (XLID) is a group of disorders affecting mainly males that besides intellectual impairment (IQ<70) below the age of 18 display significant limitations of at least two adaptive skills. These findings might not be associated with other clinical features (non-syndromic form), but can also be accompanied by dysmorphism, malformations or other neurological abnormalities (syndromic form) (Gecz et al. 2009, Rejeb et al. 2009). So far over 215 conditions associated with XLID have been described and some of them are linked to genes that code for proteins involved in neuronal differentiation, synaptic plasticity, synaptic vesicle cycling, regulation of the actin cytoskeleton, chromatin remodeling and regulation of gene expression. In families with XLID a specific pattern of disease occurrence is observed – the disorder affects male family members while the women are only carries of mutations in different genes localized on the X chromosome and rarely display clinical fea-
tures that depend on the X chromosome inactivation ratio (Chiorazzi et al. 2008).

The X chromosome inactivation is strictly regulated process of repression of gene transcription on the X chromosome because of dosage compensation between the sexes. As the process is random and both X chromosomes should be inactivated in an equal ratio, in the adult organism mosaicism is observed. The X chromosome inactivation starts in the early embryo, when the fetus has about 200 cells and involves many epigenetic mechanisms. The process starts from the expression of the XIST transcript from the X chromosome that will be inactivated (Xi) – a non-coding RNA particle that accumulates within the territory of Xi. This is the signal for deacetylation of histone H3 and demethylation of lysine 4 of H3 (H3K4) that are followed by ubiquitination of H2A and methylation of lysine 27 of H3 (H3K27) as well as binding of repressor proteins from the Trithorax and polycomb families and SAF-A scaffold factor. Moreover, the promoter regions on the inactivated X chromosome become methylated by DNMT1 and SmcHDI proteins. All these modifications act together and repress gene expression from the inactivated X chromosome (Gendrel and Heard 2011, Ohhata and Wutz 2012).

The X chromosome inactivation is random and the ratio between the active and inactive chromosomes is equal (Gendrel and Heard 2011). However, in women from XLID families, non-random X chromosome inactivation is observed that is a signal that a specific mutation may exist on the inactivated chromosome. The higher proportion of one X chromosome inactivation can be due to the fact that a mutation in a specific gene might negatively affect cell viability or proliferation rate. Therefore the silencing of a specific X chromosome will have a positive impact on cell growth and division. In the case of XLID families, mothers carrying the mutation display an altered X-inactivation pattern with a ratio ≥80≤20. In the case of women with the mutation and random X chromosome inactivation, the clinical features typical for a specific X-linked disease might be observed (Plenge et al. 2002, Knudsen et al. 2006, Yonath et al. 2011).

**Assisted reproductive technologies (ART) and epigenetic disturbances**

In developing countries, over 1% of pregnancies were suggested to involve one of the techniques used in assisted reproductive technologies (ART) like hormone stimulation of oocyte production, *in vitro* maturation of oocytes, *in vitro* fertilization (IVF), intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI), *in vitro* culture of preimplantation embryos and cryopreservation of gametes or embryos. Recently published data have suggested a link between ART and a higher risk of imprinting defects and thus imprinting disorder development.

In fact, the external factors that act on gametes and developing embryos *in vitro* might influence the epigenetic regulation of gene expression including imprinting. In particular, two important phases of imprinting pattern development can be affected by ART methods. Firstly, ART may influence the establishment of maternal imprinting in oocytes that naturally takes place just prior to ovulation. In the case of ovary stimulation, the oocytes are collected directly from the organ and cultured *in vitro* which giving rise to the possibility that the imprinting process might be disturbed. Secondly, the *in vitro* culture of early embryos might also influence the global demethylation of the genome that takes place just after fertilization. Although during this process the parental imprint is maintained it cannot be excluded it might be also affected by environmental factors (Owen and Segars Jr 2009).

Several studies performed on animal models confirmed the relationship between assisted reproductive technologies and higher incidence of imprinting changes in embryos. Experiments on mice have shown that the culture media might affect the process of imprinting and gene expression. In mouse embryos cultured in Whitten’s medium, the abnormal higher expression of the *H19* gene (this expression is essential for proper fetal growth) due to the loss of methylation on the paternal allele was observed. This was not found when the embryos were cultured in KSOM media containing amino acids. Further analysis has shown that the culture conditions might also affect the expression of other imprinted, growth-related genes like *IGF2*, *GRB10* or *GRB7*. It was also shown that the mouse two-cells embryos cultured *in vitro* have a higher methylation level and a lower degree of demethylation of male pronuclei. Also observations on cattle embryos confirm the relationship between ART and imprinting defects as their *in vitro* culture leads to the hypomethylation of the *IGF2R* gene resulting in a well-known phenotype – large offspring syndrome characterized by fetal overgrowth and perinatal death (Iliadou et al. 2011, El Hajj and Haff 2013).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>DNMT1</em>-Related Dementia, Deafness, and Sensory Neuropathy</td>
<td>19p13.2</td>
<td><em>DNMT1</em></td>
<td>DNA methyltransferase</td>
<td>Klein et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunodeficiency-Centromeric Instability-Facial Anomalies Syndrome</td>
<td>20q11.21</td>
<td><em>DNMT3B</em></td>
<td>DNA methyltransferase</td>
<td>Ehrlich et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rett syndrome and Rett-like syndrome</td>
<td>Xq28</td>
<td><em>MECP2</em></td>
<td>methyl-DNA binding protein</td>
<td>Christodoulou and Ho 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>CDKL5</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>FOXG1</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>18q21.1</td>
<td><em>MBD1</em></td>
<td>methyl-DNA binding proteins</td>
<td>Li et al. 2005, Cukier et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18q21.2</td>
<td><em>MBD2</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19p13.3</td>
<td><em>MBD3</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3q21.3</td>
<td><em>MBD4</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitopatellar syndrome</td>
<td>10q22.2</td>
<td><em>MST4</em></td>
<td>histone acetyltransferase</td>
<td>Campeau et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say-Barber-Biesecker-Young-Simpson syndrome</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(KAT6B)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubinstein-Taybi Syndrome</td>
<td>16p13</td>
<td>CREBBP, EP300</td>
<td>histone acetyltransferase</td>
<td>Roelfsema and Peters 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22q13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachydactyly-mental retardation syndrome</td>
<td>2q37.3</td>
<td><em>HDAC4</em></td>
<td>histone deacetylase</td>
<td>Williams S.R. et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia de Lange syndrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleefstra syndrome</td>
<td>9q34</td>
<td><em>EHMT1</em></td>
<td>histone methyltransferase</td>
<td>Kleefstra et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>MLL3</em></td>
<td>histone methyltransferase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>MBD5</em></td>
<td>methyl-DNA binding protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>SMARCB1</em></td>
<td>methyl-DNA binding protein subunit of the SWI/SNF complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>NR1I3</em></td>
<td>nuclear receptor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver syndrome 2</td>
<td>7q36.1</td>
<td><em>EZH2</em></td>
<td>histone methyltransferase</td>
<td>Gibson et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiedemann-Steiner syndrome</td>
<td>11q23.3</td>
<td><em>MLL</em></td>
<td>histone methyltransferase</td>
<td>Jones et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table II (cont)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Sotos syndrome**  
Weaver syndrome | 5q35  
*NSD1*  
histone methyltransferase | Rio et al. 2003 |
| **Autism** | 1q21.3  
*SETDB1*  
histone methyltransferase | Cukier et al. 2012 |
| **CHARGE syndrome** | 8q12  
*CHD7*  
DNA helicase | Legendre et al. 2012 |
| **Autism, autism spectrum disorders** | 14q11.2  
*CHD8*  
DNA helicase | O’Roak et al. 2012 |
| **α-thalassaemia ID syndrome** | Xq13  
*ATRX*  
DNA helicase | Van Bokhoven and Kramer 2010 |
| **Potocki-Shaffer syndrome** | 11p11.2  
*PHF21A*  
part of BHC repression complex | Kim et al. 2012 |
| **XLID** | Xp11.22  
*PHF8*  
histone demethylase | Qiu et al. 2010 |
| **XLID, speech delay, hyperactivity, violent behavior, seizures** | Xp11  
*JARID1C*  
histone demethylase | Santos-Rebouças et al. 2011 |
| **XLID, absent speech, seizures** | Xq24  
*UBE2A*  
ubiquitin transferase | de Leeuw et al. 2010 |
| **XLID** | Xp11.22  
*HUWE1*  
ubiquitin transferase | Froyen et al. 2008 |
| **Coffin-Lowry syndrome** | Xp22  
*RPS6KA3*  
histone and TFs kinase | Pereira et al. 2010 |
| **Nicolai-des-Baraitser syndrome (ID, epilepsy)** | 9p24.3  
*SMARCA2*  
subunit of DNA Remodeling complex | Van Houdt et al. 2012 |
| **Coffin-Siris syndrome (CSS) – MRD16** | 11p13.2  
*SMARCA4*  
subunit of DNA Remodeling complex | Tsurusaki et al. 2012 |
| **Coffin-Siris syndrome (CSS) – MRD14** | 1p36.11  
*ARID1A*  
subunit of DNA Remodeling complex | Tsurusaki et al. 2012 |

The table was prepared based on the list of genes involved in epigenetic regulation published in a paper by Weng and coworkers (2012)
The studies on epigenetic alterations in human embryos and gametes are limited due to ethical considerations. However, a higher incidence of Beckwith-Wiedemann, Silver-Russell or Angelman syndromes was reported in several clinical studies on French, Australian, American and Japanese population. On the other hand, studies on large cohorts from Denmark, Netherlands or Sweden have failed to find such relationship – the frequency of imprinting defects in ART children was comparable with the general population or no cases were found after ART. Concerning the rarity of disorders caused by epigenetic alterations, the overall risk of imprinting disorders in children born with assisted reproductive technologies is still low (Manipalviratn et al. 2009, Owen and Segars Jr 2009, van Montfoort et al. 2012).

All studies published so far have identified 1021 BWS patients. In this group, forty two patients after ART with Beckwith-Wiedemann syndrome were identified. The intracytoplasmic sperm injection and in vitro fertilization were applied in 16 and 20 cases, respectively (for 6 patients the ART type was not known) (van Montfoort et al. 2012). In the case of Angelman syndrome, together seven patients after ART (6 after ICSI, 1 after IVF) have been described in the literature (Manipalviratn et al. 2009).

It was found that the majority of BWS and AS cases born after ART display imprinting defects. The loss of methylation on the maternal allele of KCNQ1OT1 due to the imprinting defect was found in 26 out of 32 (81.2%) patients with BWS (van Montfoort et al. 2012). In five out of seven AS cases (71.4%) the loss of SNRPN gene methylation on maternal chromosome was found, that was due to the imprinting defect and only in 2 cases the deletion of 15q11-q13 region was identified (Manipalviratn et al. 2009). The rate of imprinting defects in naturally conceived children affected with these diseases is much lower and was estimated at 50–60% and 1–3% for BWS and AS, respectively (Manipalviratn et al. 2009, van Montfoort et al. 2012).

Large epidemiological studies have found that assisted reproductive technologies slightly increase the risk of birth defects. However, it is difficult to distinguish whether such risk results from the technologies used or parental factors related to the infertility problems or pregnancy itself. The good example are neural tube defects (NTD), particularly anencephaly that occurred more frequently in twin pregnancies after ART (8 cases, 1.1%) then in naturally conceived twin pregnancies (1 case, 0.1%, OR-24.6, \(P<0.001\)). Such relationship was not found for singleton pregnancies as no case of anencephaly after ART in these pregnancies was identified (Ben-Ami et al. 2011). In addition, the incidence of neural tube defects can be modified by several external factors particularly by administration of folic acid – a key player in methionine and homocysteine metabolism (Gos and Szpecht-Potocka 2002). It was suggested that inadequate folate intake can lead to alternations in the level of the S-adenosylomethionine (indispensable for DNA methylation) and impaired DNA methylation. The analysis of global DNA methylation level as well as methylation of specific sequences (e.g., LINE-1 sequences and the MGMT gene) has shown that the methylation level was lower in NTD patients, which was associated with a higher risk of disease occurrence (Wang et al. 2010, Tran et al. 2012).

The assisted reproductive technologies are also associated with 2–3 times higher risk of low birth weight that was shown to be a susceptibility factor for adult obesity, type 2 diabetes and hypertension. Although there are no longitudinal studies that assess the risk of these common diseases in children born after ART, it has been suggested that subtle epigenetic changes caused by ART might influence the susceptibility to these disorders in adulthood (Chen et al. 2010, Savage et al. 2011, El Hajj and Haff 2013).

DEFECTS OF EPIGENETIC MODIFIERS

A number of neurological diseases, mainly associated with intellectual impairment, may be caused by mutations in genes encoding proteins involved in epigenetic regulation. This group includes proteins that are direct modifiers of the chromatin structure and that directly modify the DNA (DNA methyltransferases), histone proteins (histone acetyltransferases, histone deacetylases, histone methyltransferases and histone demethylases), helicases or other histone modifying enzymes. Also the mutations in genes encoding proteins that indirectly modify chromatin structure like chromatin, DNA, methyl-DNA and histone binding proteins, specific kinases or transcription regulators may be the causes of neurological disorders (Table II). The proteins from the second group bind to chromatin or DNA and indirectly modulate the chromatin structure by the regulation of activity of direct chromatin
modifiers or their recruitment to repression or transcription complexes (Kramer and van Bokhoven 2009, van Bokhoven and Kramer 2010). The interesting fact is that somatic mutations in the genes coding for epigenetic modifiers are frequently found in all types of cancers, confirming the fact that global alterations in gene expression might induce tumor development (Miremadi et al. 2007).

The neurological disorders that are caused by germlinal mutations in genes coding for epigenetic modifiers are mainly characterized by intellectual disability that can be accompanied by other neurological features like seizures, hypotonia, autism spectrum behaviors and delayed psychomotor development. Another clinical finding in patients is the presence of specific dysmorphic features, characteristic for the specific disease (von Bokhoven and Kramer 2010). One of the most interesting diseases related to mutations in epigenetic regulators is the group of diseases associated with mutations in the MECP2 gene, that are also included in the group of X-linked intellectual disabilities.

The MECP2 gene, localized on the X chromosome, encodes a methyl-CpG binding protein, a highly conserved nuclear protein that binds to methylated DNA sequences and recruits repressors and chromatin remodeling proteins like HDAC1&2, H3K9 methyltransferase and DNMT1 methyltransferase that form the SIN3A corepressor complex. This complex is responsible for chromatin compaction and suppression of gene expression. The MECP2 protein is present in all tissues, binds to methylated DNA independently of the DNA sequence and is responsible specifically for the inhibition of transcription from the methylated promoters (Banerjee et al. 2012).

The expression of MECP2 is especially high in the brain and changes together with the development of the nervous system. Its expression is high during embryonic development, low at birth and then starts to grow. MECP2 expression is not observed in immature neurons, but is rather specific for the neuron maturation process and is further maintained in mature cells. It is especially important for maintenance and modulation of synapses and dendritic complexity. Mouse models lacking MeCP2 expression did not display significant changes in brain structure, but the processes of neuronal maturation and synaptogenesis were delayed and specific morphological and functional alterations in neurons (e.g., reduced dendritic branching, affected axonal arborization, improper synaptic scaling) were found (Kishi and Macklis 2005, Stuss et al. 2012).

The control of transcription and translation by MECP2 depends on the recruited molecules and protein-protein interactions. One of the genes, whose expression is controlled by MECP2 binding to methylated sequences, is the BDNF gene coding for brain derived neurotrophic factor. This protein is important for neuron development, synaptic maturation and plasticity. It binds to TrkB protein and activates the PI3K/AKT signaling pathway that regulates specific cellular processes like proliferation and differentiation (Cowansage et al. 2010, Diaz de Leon-Guerrero et al. 2011).

Mutations in MECP2 are associated with specific clinical phenotypes associated with intellectual disability and delayed psychomotor development. The first phenotype – Rett syndrome (occurrence rate: 1/10 000–150 000) is rather specific for girls, as it was suggested that mutations in the MECP2 gene are lethal for male fetuses with a normal karyotype. Rare cases when the male survive till birth were reported, but the newborns displayed severe neonatal encephalopathy and intellectual disability or displayed typical Rett syndrome features in the case of a 47,XXY karyotype or mosaicism (Schwartzman et al. 2001, Psoni et al. 2010). The clinical course of the disease is highly specific – the perinatal period and first months of life have a normal course, and after 18 months of life a regression of the acquired skills occurs. The disease has a progressive character – the presence of stereotypies leads to the loss of proper hand use, after an autistic like period, the loss of cognitive, motor and social skills is observed followed by severe intellectual disability, motor impairments and seizures (generalized tonic-clonic seizures or partial complex seizures). Postnatal deceleration of head growth and breathing disturbances are also common in Rett syndrome patients (Christodoulou and Ho 2012).

The phenotypes of patients with a pathogenic mutation in the MECP2 gene depend on two factors: the pattern of X chromosome inactivation and the character and localization of the mutation. If the X chromosome with the MECP2 mutation is more favorably inactivated, a milder clinical phenotype is observed. A less severe course of the disease is also found in patients carrying missense mutations or with mutations localized in the C-terminal part of the protein (Knudsen et al. 2006, Lima et al. 2009, Ravn et al. 2011, Temudo et al. 2011).
The second phenotype associated with alterations of the MECP2 gene is the MECP2 duplication syndrome that affects mainly males and results in severe to profound intellectual disability, early onset hypotonia, delayed psychomotor development, progressive spasticity of the lower limbs, predisposition to infections (observed in about 75% of the affected males), epileptic seizures (up to 50%) and other clinical features like autistic behavior, gastrointestinal dysfunction and facial dysmorphism (Ramocki et al. 2010, Van Esch 2010). The MECP2 duplication is usually inherited from healthy mothers as females carrying this mutation display extreme to complete skewing of the X chromosome. It was reported, however, that these women can display neuropsychiatric symptoms like depression or anxiety. In addition, cases of females that had a MECP2 duplication due to genomic insertion or X-autosome unbalanced translocation have been described that presented with severe ID and other features characteristic for affected males (Bijlsma et al. 2012).

MECP2 mutations are found in about 95–97% of typical Rett syndrome patients. However, the mutation detection rate is much lower in patients displaying the so-called Rett-like phenotypes (50–70%; Christodoulou and Ho 2012). The careful molecular examination of these patients revealed that also mutations in CDKL5 and FOXG1 genes are responsible for the specific phenotype. Both these genes encode proteins involved in indirect modification of chromatin structure and therefore gene expression (Guerrini and Parrini 2012). The CDKL5 encodes a cyclin dependent-like kinase 5 that was shown to interact with MECP2 and was suggested to regulate the phosphorylation of this protein (Mari et al. 2005). Further studies have revealed that only a small fraction of CDKL5 mutations is responsible for the Rett-like phenotype and that the alterations in CDKL5 gene rather are responsible for early onset epileptic encephalopathy with intractable seizures and intellectual impairment (Lin et al. 2005, Bahi-Buisson and Bienvenu 2012, Fehr et al. 2013). This was explained by the functional analysis of the protein – it was found to interact with DNMT1 – DNA methyltransferase, to be present in nuclear speckles and to regulate the activity of the splicing machinery in transcriptionally active sites, and to regulate neuronal morphogenesis and dendritic arborization by interaction with RAC1 protein and F-actin. CDKL5 is a ubiquitous protein but is expressed at very high levels in the brain, especially during early postnatal stages in maturing neurons of the hippocampus and the cerebral cortex (Kameshita et al. 2008, Ricciardi et al. 2009, Chen et al. 2010).

The second gene, mutated in Rett-like patients, is FOXG1 – encoding forkhead box protein G1, a transcriptional repressor that recruits a histone demethylase (KDM5B) and Groucho protein thus inhibiting expression of specific genes. The FOXG1 is involved in the regulation of the development of the brain and the telencephalon from which the cerebral cortex and basal ganglia are formed (Guerrini and Parrini 2012). It is especially important for progenitor to neuron transition and cell proliferation in the telencephalon (inhibits BMP4 and induces FGF8 expression). It is also expressed in the mature brain and was suggested to promote the survival of differentiated, postmitotic neurons (Florian et al. 2012). Patients carrying FOXG1 mutations have a phenotype quite similar to Rett syndrome, that differs from the typical RTT form by the presence of frank dyskinesia, the absence of the period of normal development after birth and severe postnatal microcephaly (Van der Aa et al. 2011, Roche-Martinez et al. 2011, Guerrini and Parrini 2012).

EPIGENETIC ALTERATIONS IN NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES

Epigenetic alterations can also be caused by the existing neurological disease, which has been demonstrated by the molecular comparison of epigenetic marks in tissues from persons with a specific disease and healthy ones as well as by the analyses performed on animal models for a particular disease. Such epigenetic changes are commonly observed in different neurological disorders like Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s and Huntington’s diseases, spinal muscular atrophy, Friedreich’s ataxia, adrenoleukodystrophy, multiple sclerosis, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis and epilepsy (reviewed in Urdinguio et al. 2009).

Epigenetic changes observed in patients with neurological diseases mainly include methylation changes – hypo- or hypermethylation of the genes whose expression might be crucial for proper functioning of the affected tissue. A good example is the elevated methylation level of the RELN gene in patients with temporal lobe epilepsy. The gene encodes the neural factor reelin
that regulates cell positioning, neuronal migration, synaptic function and plasticity, while its lower expression levels may affect all these processes (Qureshi and Mehler 2010, Shorvon 2011). Hypomethylation of the TNF gene in cortex and higher level of the TNFα cytokine in the cerebrospinal fluid was found in patients with Parkinson’s disease. The elevated level of TNFα in these patients was suggested to induce apoptosis in neuronal cells (Mogi et al. 1996). Also, in the case of multiple sclerosis some differences in the methylation pattern were found – the methylation of cytosines in white matter is much lower as compared to healthy controls. More specifically, the PADI2 gene encoding peptidyl arginine deiminase type II was found to be hypomethylated in multiple sclerosis patients. The higher expression of the PADI2 protein, responsible for the citrullination of myelin basic protein, stimulates myelin auto-cleavage and formation of specific epitopes that are presented to immunological system and stimulate the immunological response (Calabrese et al. 2012).

Altered modifications of histone proteins, especially hypoacetylation and H3K9 hypertrimethylation that lead to gene silencing due to chromatin compaction, have also been found in patients with neurological disorders, e.g., Huntington’s disease, Friedreich’s ataxia, multiple sclerosis, spinal muscular atrophy and Parkinson’s disease (Urdinguio et al. 2009). In the case of Huntington’s disease, the altered histone modifications are due to direct interaction of the mutant (>39polyQ) HTT protein with the CBP, a protein functioning as histone acetyltransferase, which leads to the sequestration of CBP in aggregates formed in cytoplasm and nucleus (Choi et al. 2012).

Moreover, the mouse models for specific neurological disorders have been extensively studied to assess the character and level of epigenetic changes in neural tissues. For example, in animal models of epileptogenesis induced with kainic acid or pilocarpine, changes in chromatin structure due to transient phosphorylation of H3S10 and deacetylation of H3K14 as well as changes in the expression of miRNA have been found. These observations have led to the development of new epigenetic drugs used for the treatment of epilepsy patients. One of those drugs – valproic acid, despite its function as an activator of GABAergic function, can also inhibit histone deacetylases responsible for gene expression silencing (Urdinguio et al. 2009, Kobow and Blümcke 2011, Lubin 2012).

CONCLUSIONS

The epigenetic regulation of gene expression is highly important for organism development. The appropriate genes are activated and subsequently silenced by epigenetic mechanisms during the differentiation of tissues and organs. The strict regulation of gene expression is especially important in the case of nervous system development, where the tight changes might result in improper synaptic signaling or neuronal cell differentiation and give a broad spectrum of clinical phenotypes.

It is generally known that gene expression might be modified by environmental factors, probably by affecting epigenetic marks that act on the transcription level. As the epigenetic changes are commonly found in neurodegenerative diseases and other neurological conditions it was suggested that drugs that influence the epigenetic imprint might be useful in therapy (Kelly et al. 2010). For example HDAC inhibitors, like suberoylanilide hydroxamic acid (SAHA), trichostatin A and sodium butyrate were tested as a potential drugs for Alzheimer disease, Huntington disease, multiple sclerosis or Rubinstein-Taybi syndrome (Urdinguio et al. 2009). In the case of Angelman syndrome, it was proposed that silent paternal copy of the UBE3A gene can be activated with the usage of topotecan, a topoisomerase inhibitor, a drug that is related to the regulation of DNA topology (Huang et al. 2011). However, all these substances would not only regulate the expression of genes that are related to specific disease, but also other genes, also imprinted ones. Therefore their use in clinical treatment needs further evaluation and rigorous clinical testing.

So far, besides diseases due to improper genetic imprinting, over 25 monogenic disorders have been described that are caused by mutations in genes that encode different factors involved in epigenetic regulation (Table II). However, in the era of genomic analyses, when the exome or whole genome next generation sequencing or whole-genome microarrays are applied for the molecular diagnosis of neurological diseases, it is highly probable that the number of such diseases will grow rapidly.
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