



HAL
open science

THE EXPANDING UNIVERSE OF COHESIN FUNCTIONS: A NEW GENOME STABILITY CARETAKER INVOLVED IN HUMAN DISEASE AND CANCER.

Linda Mannini, Stefania Menga, Antonio Musio

► **To cite this version:**

Linda Mannini, Stefania Menga, Antonio Musio. THE EXPANDING UNIVERSE OF COHESIN FUNCTIONS: A NEW GENOME STABILITY CARETAKER INVOLVED IN HUMAN DISEASE AND CANCER.. Human Mutation, 2010, 31 (6), pp.623. <10.1002/humu.21252>. <hal-00552379>

HAL Id: hal-00552379

<https://hal.science/hal-00552379v1>

Submitted on 6 Jan 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization



**THE EXPANDING UNIVERSE OF COHESIN FUNCTIONS: A
NEW GENOME STABILITY CARETAKER INVOLVED IN HUMAN
DISEASE AND CANCER.**

Journal:	<i>Human Mutation</i>
Manuscript ID:	humu-2009-0533.R3
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Mar-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Mannini, Linda; Istituto di Tecnologie Biomediche C.N.R., Unita' di Pisa Menga, Stefania; Istituto di Tecnologie Biomediche C.N.R., Unita' di Pisa Musio, Antonio; Istituto di Tecnologie Biomediche C.N.R., Unita' di Pisa
Key Words:	Cohesin, Cornelia de Lange syndrome, Roberts syndrome , Genome instability, Cancer



Humu-2009-0533

Review

Supporting Information for this preprint is available from the
Human Mutation editorial office upon request (humu@wiley.com)

**THE EXPANDING UNIVERSE OF COHESIN FUNCTIONS: A NEW GENOME
STABILITY CARETAKER INVOLVED IN HUMAN DISEASE AND CANCER**

Linda Mannini¹, Stefania Menga¹, Antonio Musio^{1,2,*}

1 Istituto di Tecnologie Biomediche, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Pisa, Italy.

2 Istituto Toscano Tumori, Florence, Italy.

* Correspondence to: Antonio Musio, Istituto di Tecnologie Biomediche, Consiglio Nazionale
delle Ricerche, Pisa, Italy

Tel: +39 0503152776

Fax: +39 0503153973

Email: antonio.musio@itb.cnr.it

ABSTRACT

Cohesin is responsible for sister chromatid cohesion, ensuring the correct chromosome segregation. Beyond this role, cohesin and regulatory cohesin genes seem to play a role in preserving genome stability and gene transcription regulation. DNA damage is thought to be a major culprit for many human diseases, including cancer. Our present knowledge of the molecular basis underlying genome instability is extremely limited. Mutations in cohesin genes cause human diseases such as the Cornelia de Lange syndrome and the Roberts syndrome/SC phocomelia, and all the cell lines derived from affected patients show genome instability. Cohesin mutations have also been identified in colorectal cancer. Here, we will discuss the human disorders caused by the alterations of cohesin function, with emphasis on the emerging role of cohesin as a genome stability caretaker.

Key words: Cohesin, genome instability, cancer, Cornelia de Lange syndrome, Roberts syndrome

OVERVIEW OF COHESIN FUNCTIONS

Canonical role of cohesin

The discovery of the cohesin complex has led to a breakthrough in clarifying the “cohesive force” in play during mitosis in holding the sister chromatids together and ensuring correct chromosome segregation. Cohesin is composed of four subunits, a pair of SMC proteins, SMC1A (MIM# 300040) and SMC3 (MIM# 606062), which are members of the Structural Maintenance of Chromosome family, and two non-SMC proteins, RAD21/Scc1 (MIM# 606462) and STAG/Scc3/Sa (Table 1) [Michaelis et al., 1997]. In vertebrates, there are two closely related Scc3 homologs, called STAG1 (MIM# 604358) and STAG2 (MIM# 604359) [Losada et al., 2000; Sumara et al., 2000]. In addition, a meiotic isoform is also present, named STAG3 (MIM# 608489) [Prieto et al., 2001]. SMC proteins are characterized by a globular hinge domain flanked by two α -helical domains (Figure 1A) which fold back on themselves at the hinge, forming a long antiparallel α -helical coiled coil arm that brings the N and C termini together. The N-terminal contains the Walker A box (or P-loop) which binds ATP. The C-terminal holds the Walker B, binding to DNA. SMC1A and SMC3 dimerize at the hinge domains, forming a V-shaped structure through hydrophobic interactions. Basically, the cohesin complex acts as a tripartite ring in which SMC1A and SMC3 are connected by their hinge domains on one side, and RAD21 closes the ring by connecting the SMC1A and SMC3 head domains on the other side [Anderson et al., 2002; Haering et al., 2002] (Figure 2). The cohesin ring shape supports the model where interaction between cohesin and DNA is topological, the so-called “ring” or “embrace” model. According to this model, cohesin topologically encircles sister chromatids. The cohesin opens at the head domain followed by the sister chromatid entering the ring and

1
2
3
4 becoming topologically entrapped when RAD21 locks the ring [Gruber et al., 2006; Gruber et
5
6 al., 2003; Haering, et al., 2002; Haering et al., 2004; Ivanov and Nasmyth, 2007]. Transient
7
8 dissociation of SMC hinge domains also seems to contribute towards the entry of DNA into the
9
10 cohesin ring [Gruber et al., 2006]. Several alternative models, as well as the bracelet,
11
12 oligomerization and snap models have been proposed as the molecular basis of sister chromatid
13
14 cohesion [Diaz-Martinez et al., 2008; Guacci 2007; Huang et al., 2005; Milutinovich and
15
16 Koshland, 2003]. These models have stimulated the research in this field and the true mechanism
17
18 may be a combination of those proposed. The cohesin binding to chromatin is dynamic and
19
20 occurs during the G1/S phase in the budding yeast or in the telophase of the previous cell cycle
21
22 in vertebrates [Haering et al., 2004]. In yeast, cohesin binds along chromosome arms every 10-20
23
24 kb, while its density is higher at centromeric regions [Glynn et al., 2004; Kogut et al., 2009;
25
26 Lengronne et al., 2004]. By contrast, in *Drosophila* the cohesin binding regions cover from a few
27
28 kilobases up to 100 kb in length [Misulovin et al., 2008]. Though the chromosome arm
29
30 dissociation process has yet to be fully understood, removal of cohesin begins in the prophase
31
32 and is completed by the anaphase. In the first step, RAD21 and STAG subunits are
33
34 phosphorylated by Polo-like kinase 1, causing the dissociation of the cohesin only along the
35
36 chromosome arms [Hauf et al., 2005], while the bulk of centromeric cohesin remains unchanged
37
38 [Waizenegger et al., 2000]. Once chromosomes are bi-oriented on the mitotic spindle at
39
40 anaphase, cohesin is completely removed from chromosomes by the separase protein (MIM#
41
42 604143) that cleaves RAD21, triggering sister chromatid disjunction. Initially, separase is
43
44 inactivated through an association with securin (MIM# 604147), which is released after
45
46 degradation through the ubiquitin dependent proteolysis pathway [Hauf et al., 2001; Uhlmann et
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 al., 2000]. This model suggests that cohesin, preserved from degradation by separase during the
5
6 prophase, can be loaded onto chromatin just after the restoration of the nuclear membrane.
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Cohesin regulatory factors**

13
14 Cohesin interacts with several other proteins contributing towards its function (Table 1).
15

16
17 The loading of cohesin onto chromatin requires NIPBL activity (MIM# 608667, homolog of
18
19 fungal *Scs2* and *Drosophila* Nipped-B). It has been speculated that NIPBL may be involved in
20
21 the activation of SMC ATPase and chromatin remodeling [Arumugam et al., 2003; Jahnke et al.,
22
23 2008]. PDS5A (MIM# 613200) and PDS5B (MIM# 605333) proteins are essential for the
24
25 association of cohesin with chromatin and sister chromatid cohesion. Their amino acid sequences
26
27 are conserved during evolution and are characterized by HEAT repeats which promote protein
28
29 interaction [Panizza et al., 2000]. The presence of two PDS5 and STAG proteins renders possible
30
31 the existence of four different types of cohesin containing either STAG1 or STAG2 and either
32
33 PDS5A or PDS5B [Losada et al., 2005; Sumara et al., 2000]. Cohesin is also associated with
34
35 WAPL; and like the PDS5 proteins, WAPL (MIM# 610754) also contains motifs which promote
36
37 protein-protein interaction. In fact, it has been shown that the FGF motifs of the WAPL protein
38
39 allow the physical interaction with PDS5 and cohesin subunits [Shintomi and Hirano, 2009]. It is
40
41 thought that WAPL is involved in the process of removing cohesin from chromatin [Gandhi et
42
43 al., 2006; Kueng et al., 2006]. ESCO2 (MIM# 609353) is involved in the establishment of
44
45 bridges between chromatid sisters during the cell cycle [Ivanov et al., 2002; Skibbens et al.,
46
47 1999; Toth et al., 1999]. It is also involved in the SMC3 acetylation [Heidinger-Pauli et al.,
48
49 2009; Zhang et al., 2008a], necessary for replication fork progression [Terret et al., 2009].
50
51 Sororin (MIM# 609374) is the last identified protein known to be involved in cohesin activity.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Data regarding this protein are limited; however, it has been hypothesized that it is involved in
5
6 sister chromatid cohesion [Rankin et al., 2005; Schmitz et al., 2007]. It is clear that cohesin
7
8 activity is tightly regulated and it is possible that new regulatory proteins will be identified in the
9
10 near future.
11
12

13 14 15 16 **NON CANONICAL ROLE OF COHESIN: GENE EXPRESSION REGULATION**

17
18 There is increasing experimental evidence suggesting that cohesin plays a part in the regulation
19
20 of gene expression. The first proof that cohesin factors regulate gene expression comes from
21
22 studies on the *Drosophila Ultrabithorax* and *Cut* genes which are involved in many
23
24 developmental processes [Rollins et al., 1999]. In fact, the expression depends on Nipped-B
25
26 which might facilitate the interaction between promoter and remote enhancers possibly by
27
28 regulating chromosome architecture. Since Nipped-B acts as a cohesin regulatory protein, it was
29
30 hypothesised that cohesin would have the same effect as Nipped-B on the gene expression
31
32 regulation. Surprisingly, the inhibition of *Smc1a*, *Rad21* and *Sa* led to an increase of *Cut*
33
34 expression [Dorsett et al., 2005; Rollins et al., 2004]. These findings highlighted a possible role
35
36 of cohesin as an insulator, inhibiting enhancer-promoter communication in *Cut*, and suggested
37
38 that *Nipped-B* promotes enhancer-promoter interaction by altering cohesin binding to chromatin
39
40 [Rollins et al., 2004]. Notably, cohesin contributes to the insulator activity of the CCCTC
41
42 binding factor (CTCF), a zinc finger DNA-binding protein that is evolutionary conserved
43
44 [Parelho et al., 2008; Rubio et al., 2008; Stedman et al., 2008; Wendt et al., 2008]. However,
45
46 recent data suggest that the manner in which cohesin regulates gene expression is more complex.
47
48 The fact that the depletion of either *Rad21* or *Smc3* in Zebrafish results in the reduced expression
49
50 of *Runx* genes, involved in the activation of hematopoietic and neurogenic genes has been
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 demonstrated [Horsfield et al., 2007]. Studies in *Drosophila* show that cohesin can exert
5
6 opposing effects, both positive and negative, on gene expression [Schaaf et al., 2009]. These
7
8 results are consistent with gene expression data obtained in Cornelia de Lange syndrome (CdLS;
9
10 MIM#s 122470, 300590, 610759) cell lines and in *Nipbl*^{+/-} mutant mice where many genes are
11
12 down- and up-regulated [Kawauchi et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2009b]. Beyond its role in sister
13
14 chromatid cohesion, emerging data show that the activity of cohesin and cohesin regulatory
15
16 factors is critical for the proper development of organisms by regulating gene expression in
17
18 multiple ways.
19
20
21

22
23 Mutations in *NIPBL*, *SMC1A* and *SMC3* cause CdLS while mutations in *ESCO2* are associated
24
25 with Roberts syndrome (RBS; MIM# 268300) /SC phocomelia (MIM# 269000) [Deardorff et
26
27 al., 2007; Krantz et al., 2004; Musio et al., 2006; Schule et al., 2005; Tonkin et al., 2004; Vega et
28
29 al., 2005]. CdLS and RBS are collectively termed “cohesinopathies” [reviewed in Liu and
30
31 Krantz, 2008]. CdLS is the most frequent disease among those due to cohesion pathway defects.
32
33
34 Though the molecular pathobiology of CdLS is largely unknown, it is noteworthy that the
35
36 dysregulation of gene expression likely represents the underlying pathogenesis of CdLS. It has
37
38 recently been discovered, by using a genome-wide approach to study gene expression, that
39
40 alteration of a restricted number of genes which can be considered as CdLS biomarkers are
41
42 capable of differentiating CdLS from non-CdLS samples. Their expression levels also correlate
43
44 with the phenotypic severity of the disorder [Liu et al., 2009b]. In addition, small changes in
45
46 *Nipbl* activity affect appropriate development in the *Nipbl*^{+/-} mouse model. In particular, gene
47
48 expression profiling demonstrates that *Nipbl* deficiency leads to modest but significant
49
50 transcriptional dysregulation of many genes [Kawauchi et al., 2009].
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Cohesinopathy cell lines show both spontaneous and induced genome instability. In addition,
5
6 mutations or dysregulation of cohesin and regulatory cohesin genes are associated with human
7
8 cancer (see below). These observations suggest that the cohesin pathway may be involved in
9
10 genome stability maintenance and tumorigenesis. This review focuses specifically on the
11
12 emerging role of cohesin as a new genome stability caretaker involved in human disease and
13
14
15
16 cancer.
17

20 21 **COHESIN AND GENOME INSTABILITY**

22
23 Genome instability has been discovered as one of the major factors responsible for human
24
25 diseases, including cancer. It manifests as point mutations, gene amplifications, aneuploidies (i.e.
26
27 the gain or loss of entire chromosomes), deletions and translocations. The genomic stability
28
29 depends on an intricate machinery of DNA repair mechanisms, correct chromosome segregation
30
31 pathways and the activation of cell cycle checkpoints in order to arrest cell cycle progression.
32
33
34 The initial confirmation that cohesin is involved in genome stability came from studies in *S.*
35
36 *pombe*. *Scc1* mutants are hypersensitive to DNA damage [Birkenbihl and Subramani, 1992],
37
38 suggesting that cohesin plays an important function in the DNA damage response. In recent
39
40 years, ample experimental evidence supports the notion that cohesin is also involved in genome
41
42 stability maintenance in human cells. SMC1A was shown to be the target of the ATM kinase
43
44 with phosphorylation of SMC1A-Ser957 and SMC1A-Ser966, occurring in an ATM dependent
45
46 manner after ionizing irradiation [Kim et al., 2002; Yazdi et al., 2002]. Subsequently, it has been
47
48 shown that NBS1 and BRCA1 are required for the recruitment of activated ATM at the sites of
49
50 DNA double strand breaks, and that this process is necessary for the phosphorylation of SMC1A
51
52 by ATM following irradiation [Kitagawa et al., 2004]. We showed that SMC1A phosphorylation
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 can be ATM-independent, depending on the type of DNA damage. Moreover, we found that
5
6 SMC1A is phosphorylated on Ser966 by ATR after replication stress induced by aphidicolin,
7
8 while no phosphorylation occurred on Ser957 [Musio et al., 2005]. The finding that ATM is not
9
10 involved in the SMC1A phosphorylation following replication stalling is not surprising because
11
12 it seems to be specifically involved in response to irradiation [Kim et al., 2002; Yazdi et al.,
13
14 2002]. These observations suggest that cohesin participates in two different pathways, triggering
15
16 a specific response to different DNA damage types that challenge genome stability.
17
18

19
20 The heterodimer SMC1A-SMC3 is also a member of a mammalian protein complex, called
21
22 recombination complex RC-1, which promotes DNA recombination [Jessberger et al., 1996;
23
24 Stursberg et al., 1999]. There are three additional members belonging to the RC-1 complex:
25
26 DNA ligase III, DNA polymerase ϵ , and unidentified structure-specific DNA endonuclease. It is
27
28 thought that the RC-1 complex catalyses several recombination-related reactions such as the
29
30 homology-dependent transfer of DNA between two dsDNA molecules, DNA single-strand re-
31
32 annealing, and the repair of gaps or deletions in dsDNA substrates [reviewed in Jessberger,
33
34 2002].
35
36

37
38 Following DNA damage, cohesin accumulates in a large 50 kb domain that surrounds the
39
40 damage site [Strom et al., 2004; Unal et al., 2004] and SMC1A-SMC3 are phosphorylated [Kim,
41
42 et al., 2002; Luo et al., 2008; Yazdi et al., 2002]. Cohesin's ability to establish cohesion *de novo*
43
44 is essential for DNA damage repair [Strom, et al., 2004; Unal et al., 2004] and we found that fork
45
46 stalling induced an increase in SMC1A synthesis levels [Musio et al., 2005]. These findings
47
48 suggest that the cohesin increase and its accumulation can stabilize the broken sites, acting as
49
50 scaffolding to improve the recruitment of DNA repair machinery. Furthermore, the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 phosphorylation of cohesin proteins may be required for activation of cell cycle checkpoints,
5
6 allowing cell cycle arrest and DNA repair.
7
8
9

10 11 **COHESIN AND CANCER**

12
13
14 Genome instability is thought to play a pivotal role in the tumorigenic process and it is
15
16 considered a hallmark of cancer cells. So far, only a limited number of genes thought to be
17
18 involved in the maintenance of genome instability have been identified as having somatic
19
20 mutations in human cancer. The recent finding that human colorectal cancers cells carry
21
22 mutations in cohesin genes (Figure 3) further support the notion that cohesin is involved in
23
24 genome instability and cancer. Eleven somatic mutations have been identified in more than 130
25
26 colorectal cancer cases. Six of them map to three core cohesin genes (*SMC1A*, *SMC3* and
27
28 *STAG3*), four to a regulatory cohesin gene (*NIPBL*) and one to *RNF20*, a non related cohesin
29
30 gene [Barber et al., 2008]. *SMC1A* and *NIPBL* account for 8 out of 10 mutations (Figures 3A,
31
32 3B). All *SMC1A* mutations are missense (Supp. Table S1): c.1186T>C, c.1300C>T, c.1680C>G
33
34 and c.3556G>A leading to Phe396Leu, Arg434Trp, Ile560Met and Val1186Ile changes,
35
36 respectively. The first two mutations map to the coiled-coil domain, the third to the hinge
37
38 domain and the last to carboxy terminal P-loop NTPase domain (Figure 3A). It is interesting to
39
40 note that *SMC1A* mutations are only missense in both *SMC1A*-mutated CdLS patients (see
41
42 below) and in cancer cells, suggesting that frameshift and nonsense mutations are lethal. The
43
44 four mutations in *NIPBL* are: c.1435C>T, c.2967_2968 insT, c.1660C>T, c.5378T>A leading to
45
46 Arg479X, Val992fsX, Gln664X and Met1793Lys changes (Figure 3B, Supp. Table S1). Finally,
47
48 *SMC3* and *STAG3* show the mutations c.2635C>T and c.24117C>T (Supp. Table S1), which
49
50 cause the Arg879X (Figure 3C) and Ile795Thr (Figure 3D) amino acid changes, respectively.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The majority of these mutations are heterozygous nonsense mutations which disrupt protein
5 function through the creation of stop codons. This finding raises the possibility that nonsense
6 mutations might be more predisposed to cancer than missense mutations. These mutations could
7 dysregulate cohesin activity by preventing correct protein association, by altering the SMC
8 ATPase activity or affecting the dynamic displacement of cohesin from chromatin. Colorectal
9 cancer cells are characterized by chromosomal instability, resulting in chromosome gain or loss.
10 It is possible to argue that abnormal cohesion pathway activity leads to chromosome
11 missegregation and chromosome instability. This hypothesis is supported by the observation that
12 colorectal cancer cells exhibit up to 100-fold higher rates of missegregation than normal cells
13 [Lengauer et al., 1997]. Therefore chromosomal instability in colorectal cancer cells could be a
14 direct consequence of cohesin mutations.
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In addition to core cohesin genes, there is increasing evidence also linking cohesin regulatory genes to tumorigenesis. The overexpression of *WAPL* correlates with the progression of cervical cancer malignancy (Table 1), and cells overexpressing *WAPL* develop tumors after injection into nude mice [Oikawa et al., 2004]. *Separase* is found to be significantly overexpressed in human breast cancer [Zhang et al., 2008b], osteosarcoma and prostate cancer (Table 1) [Meyer et al., 2009]. Its induction leads to premature separation of chromatids, lagging chromosomes with specific chromosome aneuploidies [Zhang, et al., 2008b]. Finally, *ESCO2* is up-regulated in more aggressive melanomas [Ryu et al., 2007], *Securin* (also known as proto-oncogene pituitary tumor transforming gene, *PTTG*) is overexpressed in pituitary tumors [Zou et al., 1999] and *RAD21* is overexpressed in breast [Atienza et al., 2005; Oishi et al., 2007] and prostate cancer (Table 1) [Porkka et al., 2004]. *ESCO2* and *Securin* promote cohesin function while *WAPL* and *Separase* antagonize this function. Therefore the fact that those genes are overexpressed in

1
2
3
4 cancer suggests that cohesin and positive and negative regulatory proteins have a complex
5
6 relationship with tumorigenesis. Indeed, in some cases these genes might act as oncogenes and in
7
8 others as tumor suppressor genes. At present, the genetic factors which determine these opposite
9
10 effects are not known.
11
12

13
14 Cancer is thought to be a multistep process in which abnormalities in proto-oncogenes and tumor
15
16 suppressors predispose cells to the acquisition of many other genetic changes which are
17
18 responsible for the acquisition of the full malignant phenotype. Cohesin could play an important
19
20 role in genome instability and tumorigenesis, and chromosome aneuploidy due to defects in
21
22 correct chromosome segregation could cause the loss of heterozygosity of tumor suppressor
23
24 genes or the improper activation of proto-oncogenes. SMC1A associates with mitotic
25
26 microtubules at the spindle pole, and SMC1A imbalance leads to multipolar spindles [Wong and
27
28 Blobel, 2008]. Furthermore, the inhibition of cohesin genes by RNA interference or antisense
29
30 oligonucleotide causes aneuploidy and micronuclei formation in dividing cells [Barber, et al.,
31
32 2008; Musio et al., 2003]. These observations suggest that the association of SMC1A with
33
34 microtubules is required for proper segregation, and its dysfunction leads to aneuploidy. In
35
36 addition, cohesin mutations could dysregulate the expression of proto-oncogenes or tumor
37
38 suppressor genes, triggering uncontrolled cell proliferation and the development of malignant
39
40 cells. In human cells, cohesin depletion leads to changes in transcription at the imprinted
41
42 *H19/IGF2* locus [Nativio et al., 2009; Wendt et al., 2008]. Several lines of evidence support the
43
44 hypothesis that the altered imprinting process at *H19/IGF2* locus is important in tumorigenesis
45
46 [Feinberg, 1999; Pollak 2008]. It is therefore possible that defects in cohesin affect this imprinted
47
48 domain and the genes within it.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

COHESINOPATHIES AND GENOME INSTABILITY

CdLS consists of characteristic facial features, hirsutism, gastroesophageal reflux, upper extremity malformations ranging from small hands to severe forms of oligodactyly and truncation of the forearms and mental retardation. Approximately 60% of CdLS probands carry a *NIPBL* mutation, most of which are point mutations or small insertions and deletions in coding regions or splice junctions. It is thought that these mutations produce either abnormal full length or truncated NIPBL proteins [Gillis et al., 2004]. A subset of CdLS probands carry mutations in the *SMC1A* and *SMC3* genes [Deardorff et al., 2007; Musio et al., 2006]. *SMC1A* is responsible for 5% of CdLS cases whereas up until now only a single proband has been found to have a mutation in *SMC3*. The *PDS5B* gene could be an additional CdLS gene. Moreover, the *Pds5B* knockout mice show several features reminiscent of the CdLS phenotype, and the genetic screening of a large cohort of CdLS patients allowed the identification of a patient carrying a mutation in the *PDS5B* gene. However, the same mutation has been found in unaffected relatives making the role of this mutation in CdLS less clear [Zhang et al., 2009].

Collectively, a total of 23 mutations in the *SMC1A* and *SMC3* core cohesion genes have been identified in CdLS (Supp. Table S1). All mutations are missense or small in-frame deletions (3 or 15 nucleotides deletion) [Deardorff et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2009a; Mannini et al., 2010]. The *SMC3* amino acid change maps to the coiled coil domain (Figure 1B) whereas the *SMC1A* amino acid changes encompass all gene domains (Figure 1C) and do not affect the synthesis of the *SMC1A* protein [Liu et al., 2009a; Musio et al., 2006; Revenkova et al., 2009]. *SMC1A* maps to Xp11.2 which escapes X chromosome inactivation [Brown et al., 1995; Tsuchiya and Willard, 2000]. Both hemizygous male and heterozygous female CdLS patients have been identified [Deardorff et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2009a; Musio et al., 2006]; it is likely that *SMC1A* mutations

1
2
3
4 act as a dominant negative in females [Liu et al., 2009a; Mannini et al., 2010; Revenkova et al.,
5
6
7 2009].

8
9 RBS is an autosomal recessive developmental disorder characterized by pre-and post-natal
10
11 growth retardation, tetraphocomelia, and craniofacial abnormalities. The causative gene of RBS
12
13 is *ESCO2* which encodes a protein belonging to the highly conserved *ECO1/CTF7* family of
14
15 acetyltransferase which is involved in regulating sister chromatid cohesion [Vega et al., 2005].
16
17
18 Most *ESCO2* mutations are expected to cause stop codons that result in truncated protein or
19
20 mRNA instability due to nonsense-mediated mRNA decay [Gordillo et al., 2008].
21
22

23 All cohesinopathy cell lines are characterized by genome instability. A number of chromosomal
24
25 rearrangements (balanced de novo translocations, duplications, deletions) have been reported in
26
27 CdLS probands. The molecular characterization of the chromosomal rearrangement
28
29 $t(5;13)(13.1;q12.1)$ allowed the identification of the *NIPBL* gene [Krantz et al., 2004]. CdLS cell
30
31 lines show a statistically significant increase of both spontaneous and induced chromosome
32
33 aberrations through genotoxic treatments such as irradiation and Mitomycin C [Revenkova et al.,
34
35 2009; Vrouwe et al., 2007]. It is possible that dysregulation of cohesion activity triggers
36
37 spontaneous genome instability and confers sensitivity to genotoxic treatments. Increased DNA
38
39 damage seems to be a common feature of CdLS, suggesting that genome instability analysis and
40
41 genotoxic agent treatments can be a useful diagnostic assay and can serve as a classification tool.
42
43
44 We found that spontaneous genome instability analysis is able to discriminate among the
45
46 different types of *SMC1A* mutations. In fact, CdLS patients carrying mutations in the head
47
48 domain show higher frequency of chromosome aberrations than patients with mutations in the
49
50 other domains [Revenkova et al., 2009].
51
52
53
54

55
56 RBS cell lines also display genome instability occurring as chromosome aneuploidies
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 andmicronuclei formation, in addition to poor growth, reduced plating efficiency and lower
5 density for confluent cultures [Jabs et al., 1991; Musio et al., 2004]. Cells from RBS patients
6 exhibit a characteristic abnormality of their constitutive heterochromatin, described as
7 precocious sister chromatid separation and puffing of the peri- and para-centromeric regions of
8 chromosomes 1, 9 and 16. Less clear is the situation in CdLS; a study reported precocious sister
9 chromatid separation [Kaur et al., 2005; Musio, et al., 2004], however more recent studies
10 showed no cohesion defects in CdLS cell lines [Castronovo et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2009b;
11 Revenkova et al., 2009; Tonkin et al., 2004; Vrouwe et al., 2007]. Similar observations have also
12 been reported in *Nipbl*^{+/-} mice [Kawauchi et al., 2009] and *Nipped-B* mutant fly [Rollins et al.,
13 2004].

14
15 To date, no mutations have been identified in other cohesin pathway genes, their effect on
16 cohesion can be inferred only by *in vitro* treatments. The depletion of *WAPL* prevents the
17 resolution of sister chromatids, while its overexpression induces premature sister chromatid
18 separation [Gandhi et al., 2006; Kueng et al., 2006]. The inactivation of Sororin leads to
19 precocious sister chromatid separation [Schmitz et al., 2007] and the inhibition of Separase
20 prevents sister chromatid separation leading to diplo- or quadruplochromosomes, indicating that
21 sister chromatids were not disjoined in the previous cell cycle [Wirth et al., 2006].

22
23 Cohesinopathy probands have a low rate of cancer; up till now only a few cases of cancer have
24 been described. In fact, four RBS patients developed oculomotor nerve cavernous angiomas,
25 malignant melanoma and rhabdomyosarcoma [Feingold 1992; Ogilvy et al., 1993; Parry et al.,
26 1986; Wenger et al., 1988] while some CdLS patients developed esophageal adenocarcinoma
27 [reviewed in Kline et al., 2007]. It is possible to speculate that genomic instability in CdLS leads
28 to the formation of certain tumors. Consistent with this notion is the observation that trisomy 21
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 promotes the development of leukemia while the frequency of solid cancers is low in Down
5
6 syndrome patients [Satgé et al., 1998]. Further epidemiologic studies will address the argument
7
8 as to whether cohesinopathies lead to cancer development.
9
10

11 12 13 14 **CONCLUSION**

15
16
17
18 It is becoming clearer that the role of cohesin is not limited to holding sister chromatids together
19
20 and ensuring correct chromosome segregation. More recent works have revealed that the
21
22 universe of cohesin functions is rapidly expanding. In fact, cohesin is essential for gene
23
24 expression regulation, cell cycle control, DNA damage response and genome stability
25
26 maintenance. Mutations or dysregulation of cohesin and regulatory cohesin genes are associated
27
28 to cohesinopathies and cancer. In addition, cohesinopathy cell lines show both spontaneous and
29
30 induced genome instability, and in some cases it is responsible for the CdLS etiopathology.
31
32
33 However, whether genome instability is a cause or a consequence of cohesinopathies is still open
34
35 to debate. The dysfunction of cohesin pathways can cause missegregation, leading to
36
37 chromosome aneuploidy, a hallmark of cancer cells, and improper activation or inhibition of
38
39 proto-oncogene or tumor suppressor genes, respectively. However, it has recently been shown
40
41 that aneuploidy represents a barrier towards cancer development [Williams et al., 2008]. It is
42
43 possible that within a population of genomic-deregulated cells those with tolerated aneuploidy
44
45 and high proliferative capacity are selected, leading to cancer development [Williams et al.,
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
2008]. Altogether this evidence supports the intriguing notion that cohesin may represent a new
genome stability caretaker in mammalian cells involved in human disease and cancer. It is
becoming increasingly clear that cell lines derived from cohesinopathy probands suffer from

1
2
3
4 defects in surveillance mechanisms, leading to genome instability. Cohesin defects and/or
5
6 genome instability, in addition to dysregulation of gene expression resulting from mutations in
7
8 cohesin genes could account for the growth retardation as well as developmental defects by
9
10 affecting the number of cells in developing tissue, leading to specific cohesinopathy phenotypes.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

19
20
21 This work is funded by grants from Istituto Toscano Tumori, Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio
22
23 delle Provincie Lombarde and Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR, RSTL).
24
25
26
27

28 **REFERENCES**

- 29
30
31
32
33
34 Anderson DE, Losada A, Erickson HP, Hirano T. 2002. Condensin and cohesin display different
35
36 arm conformations with characteristic hinge angles. *J Cell Biol* 156:419-424.
37
38 Arumugam P, Gruber S, Tanaka K, Haering CH, Mechtler K, Nasmyth K. 2003. ATP hydrolysis
39
40 is required for cohesin's association with chromosomes. *Curr Biol* 13:1941-1953.
41
42
43 Atienza JM, Roth RB, Rosette C, Smylie KJ, Kammerer S, Rehbock J, Ekblom J, Denissenko
44
45 MF. 2005. Suppression of RAD21 gene expression decreases cell growth and enhances
46
47 cytotoxicity of etoposide and bleomycin in human breast cancer cells. *Mol Cancer Ther*
48
49 4:361-368.
50
51
52 Barber TD, McManus K, Yuen KW, Reis M, Parmigiani G, Shen D, Barrett I, Nouhi Y, Spencer
53
54 F, Markowitz S, Velculescu VE, Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B, Lengauer C, Hieter P. 2008.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Feingold M. 1992. History of C-patient with SC-Roberts/pseudothalidamide syndrome. *Am J*
5
6 *Med Genet* 43:898-899.
7
8
9 Gandhi R, Gillespie PJ, Hirano T. 2006. Human Wapl is a cohesin-binding protein that promotes
10
11 sister-chromatid resolution in mitotic prophase. *Curr Biol* 16:2406-2417.
12
13
14 Gillis LA, McCallum J, Kaur M, DeScipio C, Yaeger D, Mariani A, Kline AD, Li HH, Devoto
15
16 M, Jackson LG, Krantz ID. 2004. NIPBL mutational analysis in 120 individuals with
17
18 Cornelia de Lange syndrome and evaluation of genotype-phenotype correlations. *Am J*
19
20 *Hum Genet* 75:610-623.
21
22
23 Glynn EF, Megee PC, Yu HG, Mistrot C, Unal E, Koshland DE, DeRisi JL, Gerton JL. 2004.
24
25 Genome-wide mapping of the cohesin complex in the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.
26
27 *PLoS Biol* 2:E259.
28
29
30 Gordillo M, Vega H, Trainer AH, Hou F, Sakai N, Luque R, Kayserili H, Basaran S, Skovby F,
31
32 Hennekam RC, Uzielli ML, Schnur RE, Manouvrier S, Chang S, Blair E, Hurst JA,
33
34 Forzano F, Meins M, Simola KO, Raas-Rothschild A, Schultz RA, McDaniel LD, Ozono
35
36 K, Inui K, Zou H, Jabs EW. 2008. The molecular mechanism underlying Roberts
37
38 syndrome involves loss of ESCO2 acetyltransferase activity. *Hum Mol Genet* 17:2172-
39
40 2180.
41
42
43
44 Gruber S, Arumugam P, Katou Y, Kuglitsch D, Helmhart W, Shirahige K, Nasmyth K. 2006.
45
46 Evidence that loading of cohesin onto chromosomes involves opening of its SMC hinge.
47
48 *Cell* 127:523-537.
49
50
51 Gruber S, Haering CH, Nasmyth K. 2003. Chromosomal cohesin forms a ring. *Cell* 112:765-777.
52
53
54 Guacci V. 2007. Sister chromatid cohesion: the cohesin cleavage model does not ring true.
55
56
57 *Genes Cells* 12:693-708.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Haering CH, Lowe J, Hochwagen A, Nasmyth K. 2002. Molecular architecture of SMC proteins
5 and the yeast cohesin complex. *Mol Cell* 9:773-788.
6
7
8
9 Haering CH, Schoffnegger D, Nishino T, Helmhart W, Nasmyth K, Lowe J. 2004. Structure and
10 stability of cohesin's Smc1-kleisin interaction. *Mol Cell* 15:951-964.
11
12
13
14 Hauf S, Roitinger E, Koch B, Dittrich CM, Mechtler K, Peters JM. 2005. Dissociation of cohesin
15 from chromosome arms and loss of arm cohesion during early mitosis depends on
16 phosphorylation of SA2. *PLoS Biol* 3:e69.
17
18
19
20
21 Hauf S, Waizenegger IC, Peters JM. 2001. Cohesin cleavage by separase required for anaphase
22 and cytokinesis in human cells. *Science* 293:1320-1323.
23
24
25
26 Heidinger-Pauli JM, Unal E, Koshland D. 2009. Distinct targets of the Eco1 acetyltransferase
27 modulate cohesion in S phase and in response to DNA damage. *Mol Cell* 34:311-321.
28
29
30
31 Horsfield JA, Anagnostou SH, Hu JK, Cho KH, Geisler R, Lieschke G, Crosier KE, Crosier PS.
32
33 2007. Cohesin-dependent regulation of Runx genes. *Development* 134:2639-2649.
34
35
36 Huang CE, Milutinovich M, Koshland D. 2005. Rings, bracelet or snaps: fashionable alternatives
37 for Smc complexes. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 360:537-542.
38
39
40 Ivanov D, Nasmyth K. 2007. A physical assay for sister chromatid cohesion in vitro. *Mol Cell*
41 27:300-310.
42
43
44
45 Ivanov D, Schleiffer A, Eisenhaber F, Mechtler K, Haering CH, Nasmyth K. 2002. Eco1 is a
46 novel acetyltransferase that can acetylate proteins involved in cohesion. *Curr Biol*
47 12:323-328.
48
49
50
51
52 Jabs EW, Tuck-Muller CM, Cusano R, Rattner JB. 1991. Studies of mitotic and centromeric
53 abnormalities in Roberts syndrome: implications for a defect in the mitotic mechanism.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Jahnke P, Xu W, Wulling M, Albrecht M, Gabriel H, Gillessen-Kaesbach G, Kaiser FJ. 2008.
5
6 The Cohesin loading factor NIPBL recruits histone deacetylases to mediate local
7
8 chromatin modifications. *Nucleic Acids Res* 36:6450-6458.
9
10
11 Jessberger R. 2002. The many functions of SMC proteins in chromosome dynamics. *Nat Rev*
12
13 *Mol Cell Biol* 3:767-778.
14
15
16 Jessberger R, Riwar B, Baechtold H, Akhmedov AT. 1996. SMC proteins constitute two
17
18 subunits of the mammalian recombination complex RC-1. *Embo J* 15:4061-4068.
19
20
21 Kaur M, DeScipio C, McCallum J, Yaeger D, Devoto M, Jackson LG, Spinner NB, Krantz ID.
22
23 2005. Precocious sister chromatid separation (PSCS) in Cornelia de Lange syndrome.
24
25 *Am J Med Genet A* 138:27-31.
26
27
28 Kawauchi S, Calof AL, Santos R, Lopez-Burks ME, Young CM, Hoang MP, Chua A, Lao T,
29
30 Lechner MS, Daniel JA, Nussenzweig A, Kitzes L, Yokomori K, Hallgrímsson B, Lander
31
32 AD. 2009. Multiple organ system defects and transcriptional dysregulation in the
33
34 *Nipbl(+/-)* mouse, a model of Cornelia de Lange Syndrome. *PLoS Genet* 5:e1000650.
35
36
37 Kim ST, Xu B, Kastan MB. 2002. Involvement of the cohesin protein, *Smc1*, in Atm-dependent
38
39 and independent responses to DNA damage. *Genes Dev* 16:560-570.
40
41
42 Kitagawa R, Bakkenist CJ, McKinnon PJ, Kastan MB. 2004. Phosphorylation of SMC1 is a
43
44 critical downstream event in the ATM-NBS1-BRCA1 pathway. *Genes Dev* 18:1423-
45
46 1438.
47
48
49 Kline AD, Grados M, Sponseller P, Levy HP, Blagowidow N, Schoedel C, Rampolla J, Clemens
50
51 DK, Krantz I, Kimball A, Pichard C, Tuchman D. 2007. Natural history of aging in
52
53 Cornelia de Lange syndrome. *Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet* 145C:248-260.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Kogut I, Wang J, Guacci V, Mistry RK, Megee PC. 2009. The Scc2/Scc4 cohesin loader
5 determines the distribution of cohesin on budding yeast chromosomes. *Genes Dev*
6
7 23:2345-2357.
8
9
10
11 Krantz ID, McCallum J, DeScipio C, Kaur M, Gillis LA, Yaeger D, Jukofsky L, Wasserman N,
12
13 Bottani A, Morris CA, Nowaczyk MJ, Toriello H, Bamshad MJ, Carey JC, Rappaport E,
14
15 Kawauchi S, Lander AD, Calof AL, Li HH, Devoto M, Jackson LG. 2004. Cornelia de
16
17 Lange syndrome is caused by mutations in NIPBL, the human homolog of *Drosophila*
18
19 *melanogaster* Nipped-B. *Nat Genet* 36:631-635.
20
21
22
23 Kueng S, Hegemann B, Peters BH, Lipp JJ, Schleiffer A, Mechtler K, Peters JM. 2006. Wapl
24
25 controls the dynamic association of cohesin with chromatin. *Cell* 127:955-967.
26
27
28 Lengauer C, Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B. 1997. Genetic instability in colorectal cancers. *Nature*
29
30 386:623-627.
31
32
33 Lengronne A, Katou Y, Mori S, Yokobayashi S, Kelly GP, Itoh T, Watanabe Y, Shirahige K,
34
35 Uhlmann F. 2004. Cohesin relocation from sites of chromosomal loading to places of
36
37 convergent transcription. *Nature* 430:573-578.
38
39
40 Liu J, Feldman R, Zhang Z, Deardorff MA, Haverfield EV, Kaur M, Li JR, Clark D, Kline AD,
41
42 Waggoner DJ, Das S, Jackson LG, Krantz ID. 2009a. SMC1A expression and mechanism
43
44 of pathogenicity in probands with X-Linked Cornelia de Lange syndrome. *Hum Mutat*
45
46 30:1535-1542.
47
48
49 Liu J, Krantz ID. 2008. Cohesin and human disease. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet* 9:303-
50
51 320.
52
53
54 Liu J, Zhang Z, Bando M, Itoh T, Deardorff MA, Clark D, Kaur M, Tandy S, Kondoh T,
55
56 Rappaport E, Spinner NB, Vega H, Jackson LG, Shirahige K, Krantz ID. 2009b.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Transcriptional dysregulation in NIPBL and cohesin mutant human cells. PLoS Biol
5
6
7 7:e1000119.

8
9 Losada A, Yokochi T, Hirano T. 2005. Functional contribution of Pds5 to cohesin-mediated
10
11 cohesion in human cells and *Xenopus* egg extracts. J Cell Sci 118:2133-2141.

12
13 Losada A, Yokochi T, Kobayashi R, Hirano T. 2000. Identification and characterization of
14
15 SA/Scp3p subunits in the *Xenopus* and human cohesin complexes. J Cell Biol 150:405-
16
17
18 416.

19
20
21 Luo H, Li Y, Mu JJ, Zhang J, Tonaka T, Hamamori Y, Jung SY, Wang Y, Qin J. 2008.
22
23 Regulation of intra-S phase checkpoint by ionizing radiation (IR)-dependent and IR-
24
25 independent phosphorylation of SMC3. J Biol Chem 283:19176-19183.

26
27
28 Mannini L, Liu J, Krantz ID, Musio A. 2010. Spectrum and consequences of SMC1A mutations:
29
30 the unexpected involvement of a core component of cohesin in human disease. Hum
31
32 Mutat 31:5-10.

33
34
35 Meyer R, Fofanov V, Panigrahi A, Merchant F, Zhang N, Pati D. 2009. Overexpression and
36
37 mislocalization of the chromosomal segregation protein separase in multiple human
38
39 cancers. Clin Cancer Res 15:2703-2710.

40
41
42 Michaelis C, Ciosk R, Nasmyth K. 1997. Cohesins: chromosomal proteins that prevent
43
44 premature separation of sister chromatids. Cell 91:35-45.

45
46
47 Milutinovich M, Koshland DE. 2003. Molecular biology. SMC complexes--wrapped up in
48
49 controversy. Science 300:1101-1102.

50
51
52 Misulovin Z, Schwartz YB, Li XY, Kahn TG, Gause M, MacArthur S, Fay JC, Eisen MB,
53
54 Pirrotta V, Biggin MD, Dorsett D. 2008. Association of cohesin and Nipped-B with
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 transcriptionally active regions of the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome. *Chromosoma*
5 117:89-102.
6
7

8
9 Musio A, Mariani T, Montagna C, Zambroni D, Ascoli C, Ried T, Vezzoni P. 2004.
10 Recapitulation of the Roberts syndrome cellular phenotype by inhibition of INCENP,
11 ZWINT-1 and ZW10 genes. *Gene* 331:33-40.
12
13
14

15
16 Musio A, Montagna C, Mariani T, Tilenni M, Focarelli ML, Brait L, Indino E, Benedetti PA,
17 Chessa L, Albertini A, Ried T, Vezzoni P. 2005. SMC1 involvement in fragile site
18 expression. *Hum Mol Genet* 14:525-533.
19
20
21

22
23 Musio A, Montagna C, Zambroni D, Indino E, Barbieri O, Citti L, Villa A, Ried T, Vezzoni P.
24 2003. Inhibition of BUB1 results in genomic instability and anchorage-independent
25 growth of normal human fibroblasts. *Cancer Res* 63:2855-2863.
26
27
28

29
30 Musio A, Selicorni A, Focarelli ML, Gervasini C, Milani D, Russo S, Vezzoni P, Larizza L.
31 2006. X-linked Cornelia de Lange syndrome owing to SMC1L1 mutations. *Nat Genet*
32 38:528-530.
33
34
35

36
37 Nativio R, Wendt KS, Ito Y, Huddleston JE, Uribe-Lewis S, Woodfine K, Krueger C, Reik W,
38 Peters JM, Murrell A. 2009. Cohesin is required for higher-order chromatin conformation
39 at the imprinted IGF2-H19 locus. *PLoS Genet* 5:e1000739.
40
41
42

43
44 Ogilvy CS, Pakzaban P, Lee JM. 1993. Oculomotor nerve cavernous angioma in a patient with
45 Roberts syndrome. *Surg Neurol* 40:39-42.
46
47
48

49 Oikawa K, Ohbayashi T, Kiyono T, Nishi H, Isaka K, Umezawa A, Kuroda M, Mukai K. 2004.
50 Expression of a novel human gene, human wings apart-like (hWAPL), is associated with
51 cervical carcinogenesis and tumor progression. *Cancer Res* 64:3545-3549.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Oishi Y, Nagasaki K, Miyata S, Matsuura M, Nishimura S, Akiyama F, Iwai T, Miki Y. 2007.
5
6 Functional pathway characterized by gene expression analysis of supraclavicular lymph
7
8 node metastasis-positive breast cancer. *J Hum Genet* 52:271-279.
9
10
11 Panizza S, Tanaka T, Hochwagen A, Eisenhaber F, Nasmyth K. 2000. Pds5 cooperates with
12
13 cohesin in maintaining sister chromatid cohesion. *Curr Biol* 10:1557-1564.
14
15
16 Parelho V, Hadjur S, Spivakov M, Leleu M, Sauer S, Gregson HC, Jarmuz A, Canzonetta C,
17
18 Webster Z, Nesterova T, Cobb BS, Yokomori K, Dillon N, Aragon L, Fisher AG,
19
20 Merkschlager M. 2008. Cohesins functionally associate with CTCF on mammalian
21
22 chromosome arms. *Cell* 132:422-433.
23
24
25 Parry DM, Mulvihill JJ, Tsai SE, Kaiser-Kupfer MI, Cowan JM. 1986. SC phocomelia
26
27 syndrome, premature centromere separation, and congenital cranial nerve paralysis in two
28
29 sisters, one with malignant melanoma. *Am J Med Genet* 24:653-672.
30
31
32 Pollak M. 2008. Insulin and insulin-like growth factor signalling in neoplasia. *Nat Rev Cancer*
33
34 8:915-928.
35
36
37 Porkka KP, Tammela TL, Vessella RL, Visakorpi T. 2004. RAD21 and KIAA0196 at 8q24 are
38
39 amplified and overexpressed in prostate cancer. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 39:1-10.
40
41
42 Prieto I, Suja JA, Pezzi N, Kremer L, Martinez AC, Rufas JS, Barbero JL. 2001. Mammalian
43
44 STAG3 is a cohesin specific to sister chromatid arms in meiosis I. *Nat Cell Biol* 3:761-
45
46 766.
47
48
49 Rankin S, Ayad NG, Kirschner MW. 2005. Sororin, a substrate of the anaphase-promoting
50
51 complex, is required for sister chromatid cohesion in vertebrates. *Mol Cell* 18:185-200.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Revenkova E, Focarelli ML, Susani L, Paulis M, Bassi MT, Mannini L, Frattini A, Delia D,
5
6 Krantz I, Vezzoni P, Jessberger R, Musio A. 2009. Cornelia de Lange syndrome
7
8 mutations in SMC1A or SMC3 affect binding to DNA. *Hum Mol Genet* 18:418-427.
9
10
11 Rollins RA, Korom M, Aulner N, Martens A, Dorsett D. 2004. *Drosophila* nipped-B protein
12
13 supports sister chromatid cohesion and opposes the stromalin/Scs3 cohesion factor to
14
15 facilitate long-range activation of the cut gene. *Mol Cell Biol* 24:3100-3111.
16
17
18 Rollins RA, Morcillo P, Dorsett D. 1999. Nipped-B, a *Drosophila* homologue of chromosomal
19
20 adherins, participates in activation by remote enhancers in the cut and Ultrabithorax
21
22 genes. *Genetics* 152:577-593.
23
24
25 Rubio ED, Reiss DJ, Welch PL, Disteche CM, Filippova GN, Baliga NS, Aebersold R, Ranish
26
27 JA, Krumm A. 2008. CTCF physically links cohesin to chromatin. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U*
28
29 *S A* 105:8309-8314.
30
31
32 Ryu B, Kim DS, Deluca AM, Alani RM. 2007. Comprehensive expression profiling of tumor
33
34 cell lines identifies molecular signatures of melanoma progression. *PLoS One* 2:e594.
35
36
37 Schaaf CA, Misulovin Z, Sahota G, Siddiqui AM, Schwartz YB, Kahn TG, Pirrotta V, Gause M,
38
39 Dorsett D. 2009. Regulation of the *Drosophila* Enhancer of split and invected-engrailed
40
41 gene complexes by sister chromatid cohesion proteins. *PLoS One* 4:e6202.
42
43
44 Schmitz J, Watrin E, Lenart P, Mechtler K, Peters JM. 2007. Sororin is required for stable
45
46 binding of cohesin to chromatin and for sister chromatid cohesion in interphase. *Curr*
47
48 *Biol* 17:630-636.
49
50
51 Schule B, Oviedo A, Johnston K, Pai S, Francke U. 2005. Inactivating mutations in ESCO2
52
53 cause SC phocomelia and Roberts syndrome: no phenotype-genotype correlation. *Am J*
54
55 *Hum Genet* 77:1117-1128.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Shintomi K, Hirano T. 2009. Releasing cohesin from chromosome arms in early mitosis:
5
6 opposing actions of Wapl-Pds5 and Sgo1. *Genes Dev* 23:2224-2236.
7
8
9 Skibbens RV, Corson LB, Koshland D, Hieter P. 1999. Ctf7p is essential for sister chromatid
10
11 cohesion and links mitotic chromosome structure to the DNA replication machinery.
12
13 *Genes Dev* 13:307-319.
14
15
16 Satgé D, Sommelet D, Geneix A, Nishi M, Malet P, Vekemans M. 1998. A tumor profile in
17
18 Down syndrome. *Am J Med Genet* 78:207-216.
19
20
21 Stedman W, Kang H, Lin S, Kissil JL, Bartolomei MS, Lieberman PM. 2008. Cohesins localize
22
23 with CTCF at the KSHV latency control region and at cellular c-myc and H19/Igf2
24
25 insulators. *Embo J* 27:654-666.
26
27
28 Strom L, Lindroos HB, Shirahige K, Sjogren C. 2004. Postreplicative recruitment of cohesin to
29
30 double-strand breaks is required for DNA repair. *Mol Cell* 16:1003-1015.
31
32
33 Stursberg S, Riwar B, Jessberger R. 1999. Cloning and characterization of mammalian SMC1
34
35 and SMC3 genes and proteins, components of the DNA recombination complexes RC-1.
36
37 *Gene* 228:1-12.
38
39
40 Sumara I, Vorlaufer E, Gieffers C, Peters BH, Peters JM. 2000. Characterization of vertebrate
41
42 cohesin complexes and their regulation in prophase. *J Cell Biol* 151:749-762.
43
44
45 Terret ME, Sherwood R, Rahman S, Qin J, Jallepalli PV. 2009. Cohesin acetylation speeds the
46
47 replication fork. *Nature* 462:231-234.
48
49
50 Tonkin ET, Wang TJ, Lisgo S, Bamshad MJ, Strachan T. 2004. NIPBL, encoding a homolog of
51
52 fungal Scc2-type sister chromatid cohesion proteins and fly Nipped-B, is mutated in
53
54 Cornelia de Lange syndrome. *Nat Genet* 36:636-641.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Toth A, Ciosk R, Uhlmann F, Galova M, Schleiffer A, Nasmyth K. 1999. Yeast cohesin complex
5 requires a conserved protein, Eco1p(Ctf7), to establish cohesion between sister
6 chromatids during DNA replication. *Genes Dev* 13:320-333.
7
8
9
10
11 Tsuchiya KD, Willard HF. 2000. Chromosomal domains and escape from X inactivation:
12 comparative X inactivation analysis in mouse and human. *Mamm Genome* 11:849-854.
13
14
15
16 Uhlmann F, Wernic D, Poupart MA, Koonin EV, Nasmyth K. 2000. Cleavage of cohesin by the
17 CD clan protease separin triggers anaphase in yeast. *Cell* 103:375-386.
18
19
20
21 Unal E, Arbel-Eden A, Sattler U, Shroff R, Lichten M, Haber JE, Koshland D. 2004. DNA
22 damage response pathway uses histone modification to assemble a double-strand break-
23 specific cohesin domain. *Mol Cell* 16:991-1002.
24
25
26
27
28 Vega H, Waisfisz Q, Gordillo M, Sakai N, Yanagihara I, Yamada M, van Gosliga D, Kayserili
29 H, Xu C, Ozono K, Jabs EW, Inui K, Joenje H. 2005. Roberts syndrome is caused by
30 mutations in ESCO2, a human homolog of yeast ECO1 that is essential for the
31 establishment of sister chromatid cohesion. *Nat Genet* 37:468-470.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Vrouwe MG, Elghalbzouri-Maghrani E, Meijers M, Schouten P, Godthelp BC, Bhuiyan ZA,
39 Redeker EJ, Mannens MM, Mullenders LH, Pastink A, Darroudi F. 2007. Increased DNA
40 damage sensitivity of Cornelia de Lange syndrome cells: evidence for impaired
41 recombinational repair. *Hum Mol Genet* 16:1478-1487.
42
43
44
45
46
47 Waizenegger IC, Hauf S, Meinke A, Peters JM. 2000. Two distinct pathways remove
48 mammalian cohesin from chromosome arms in prophase and from centromeres in
49 anaphase. *Cell* 103:399-410.
50
51
52
53
54 Wendt KS, Yoshida K, Itoh T, Bando M, Koch B, Schirghuber E, Tsutsumi S, Nagae G, Ishihara
55 K, Mishiro T, Yahata K, Imamoto F, Aburatani H, Nakao M, Imamoto N, Maeshima K,
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Shirahige K, Peters JM. 2008. Cohesin mediates transcriptional insulation by CCCTC-
5 binding factor. *Nature* 451:796-801.
6
7
8
9 Wenger SL, Blatt J, Steele MW, Lloyd DA, Bellinger M, Phebus CK, Horn M, Jaffe R. 1988.
10 Rhabdomyosarcoma in Roberts syndrome. *Cancer Genet Cytogenet* 31:285-289.
11
12
13 Williams BR, Prabhu VR, Hunter KE, Glazier CM, Whittaker CA, Housman DE, Amon A.
14 2008. Aneuploidy affects proliferation and spontaneous immortalization in mammalian
15 cells. *Science* 322:703-709.
16
17
18
19
20
21 Wirth KG, Wutz G, Kudo NR, Desdouets C, Zetterberg A, Taghybeeglu S, Seznec J, Ducos GM,
22 Ricci R, Firnberg N, Peters JM, Nasmyth K. 2006. Separase: a universal trigger for sister
23 chromatid disjunction but not chromosome cycle progression. *J Cell Biol* 172:847-860.
24
25
26
27
28
29 Wong RW, Blobel G. 2008. Cohesin subunit SMC1 associates with mitotic microtubules at the
30 spindle pole. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 105:15441-15445.
31
32
33 Yazdi PT, Wang Y, Zhao S, Patel N, Lee EY, Qin J. 2002. SMC1 is a downstream effector in the
34 ATM/NBS1 branch of the human S-phase checkpoint. *Genes Dev* 16:571-582.
35
36
37
38 Zhang B, Chang J, Fu M, Huang J, Kashyap R, Salavaggione E, Jain S, Kulkarni S, Deardorff
39 MA, Uzielli ML, Dorsett D, Beebe DC, Jay PY, Heuckeroth RO, Krantz I, Milbrandt J.
40 2009. Dosage effects of cohesin regulatory factor PDS5 on mammalian development:
41 implications for cohesinopathies. *PLoS One* 4:e5232.
42
43
44
45
46
47 Zhang J, Shi X, Li Y, Kim BJ, Jia J, Huang Z, Yang T, Fu X, Jung SY, Wang Y, Zhang P, Kim
48 ST, Pan X, Qin J. 2008a. Acetylation of Smc3 by Eco1 is required for S phase sister
49 chromatid cohesion in both human and yeast. *Mol Cell* 31:143-151.
50
51
52
53
54 Zhang N, Ge G, Meyer R, Sethi S, Basu D, Pradhan S, Zhao YJ, Li XN, Cai WW, El-Naggar
55 AK, Baladandayuthapani V, Kittrell FS, Rao PH, Medina D, Pati D. 2008b.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Overexpression of Separase induces aneuploidy and mammary tumorigenesis. Proc Natl
5 Acad Sci U S A 105:13033-13038.
6
7

8
9 Zou H, McGarry TJ, Bernal T, Kirschner MW. 1999. Identification of a vertebrate sister-
10 chromatid separation inhibitor involved in transformation and tumorigenesis. Science
11 285:418-422.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

22
23 **Figure 1.** SMC core cohesin protein organization and CdLS. (A) Schematic organization of
24 SMC proteins. They contain five distinct domains: N-terminal (or P-loop NTPase), a hinge motif
25 flanked by two coiled coil regions and a C-terminal (or P-loop NTPase); (B) Mapping of the
26 amino acid change identified in a CdLS patient in the SMC3 protein; (C) Localization onto the
27 SMC1A protein of the twenty two amino acid mutations identified in CdLS.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 **Figure 2.** Structure of cohesin complex. The somatic vertebrate core cohesin complex consists of
39 two SMC subunits, namely SMC1A and SMC3, and two non SMC subunits, RAD21 and
40 STAG. Each SMC subunit forms a rod shaped protein with a globular hinge domain at one end
41 and an ATP nucleotide binding domain at the other. SMC1A and SMC3 are connected by their
42 hinge domains on one side and the RAD21 closes the ring by connecting SMC1A and SMC3
43 head domains on the other side, creating a huge tripartite ring.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Figure 3.** Cohesin and regulatory cohesin proteins and colorectal cancer. Localization of the four
55 amino acid changes identified in both SMC1A (A) and NIPBL (B), and the single change
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


detected in SMC3 (C) and STAG3 (D). The protein length is not in scale.

For Peer Review

Table 1. Components of cohesin pathway and their involvement in human diseases


Gene	OMIM	Role	Disease
<i>SMC1A</i>	300040	Core cohesin member	CdLS Colorectal cancer
<i>SMC3</i>	606062	Core cohesin member	CdLS Colorectal cancer
<i>RAD21</i>	606462	Core cohesin member	Breast cancer Prostate cancer
<i>STAG1</i>	604358	Core cohesin member	
<i>STAG2</i>	604359	Core cohesin member	
<i>STAG3</i>	608489	Core cohesin member	Colorectal cancer
<i>ESCO2</i>	609353	Cohesin regulatory, sister chromatid cohesion	RBS Melanoma cancer
<i>NIPBL</i>	608667	Cohesin regulatory, cohesin loading	CdLS Colorectal cancer
<i>PDS5A</i>	613200	Cohesin regulatory, sister chromatid cohesion	
<i>PDS5B</i>	605333	Cohesin regulatory, sister chromatid cohesion	CdLS

<i>PTTG1</i> (Securin)	604147	Cohesin regulatory, sister chromatid dissociation	Pituitary cancer
<i>ESPL1</i> (Separase)	604143	Cohesin regulatory, sister chromatid dissociation	Breast cancer Osteosarcoma Prostate cancer
<i>CDCA5</i> (Sorotin)	609374	Cohesin regulatory, sister chromatid cohesion	
<i>WAPL</i>	610754	Cohesin regulatory, cohesin dissociation	Cervical Cancer



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2



99x110mm (200 x 200 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3

128x99mm (200 x 200 DPI)

review

Supp. Table S1. Mutational spectrum of the *SMC1A*, *SMC3*, *STAG3* and *NIPBL* in human disease

Gene	Nucleotide changes*	Effect on amino acid	Disease
<i>SMC1A</i>	c.173_187del15	p.Val58-Arg62del	CdLS
	c.397T>G	p.Phe133Val	CdLS
	c.421G>A	p.Glu141Lys	CdLS
	c.587G>A	p.Arg196His	CdLS
	c.802_804del3	p.Lys268del	CdLS
	c.916_918del3	p.Ser306del	CdLS
	c.1193G>A	p.Arg398Gln	CdLS
	c.1478A>C	p.Glu493Ala	CdLS
	c.1486C>T	p.Arg496Cys	CdLS
	c.1487G>A	p.Arg496His	CdLS
	c.2046_2048del3	p.Glu683del	CdLS
	c.2077C>G	p.Arg693Gly	CdLS
	c.2131C>T	p.Arg711Trp	CdLS
	c.2342G>T	p.Cys781Phe	CdLS
	c.2369G>A	p.Arg790Gln	CdLS
	c.2446C>G	p.Arg816Gly	CdLS
	c.2467T>C	p.Phe823Leu	CdLS
	c.2493_2495del3	p.Asp831- Gln832del	CdLS
	c.3146G>A	p.Arg1049Gln	CdLS
	c.3254A>G	p.Tyr1085Cys	CdLS
c.3364T>C	p.Phe1122Leu	CdLS	
c.3367C>T	p.Arg1123Trp	CdLS	
c.1186T>C	p.Phe396Leu	Colorectal cancer	
c.1300C>T	p.Arg434Trp	Colorectal cancer	
c.1680C>G	p.Ile560Met	Colorectal cancer	
c.3556G>A	p.Val1186Ile	Colorectal cancer	
<i>SMC3</i>	c.1464_1466del3	p.Phe488del	CdLS
	c.2635C>T	p.Arg879X	Colorectal cancer
<i>STAG3</i>	c.2384T>C	p.Ile795Thr	Colorectal cancer
<i>NIPBL</i>	c.1435C>T	p.Arg479X	Colorectal cancer
	c.2967_2968insT	p.Val992fsX	Colorectal cancer
	c.1660C>T	p.Gln554X	Colorectal cancer
	c.5378T>A	p.Met1793Lys	Colorectal cancer

* Nucleotide numbering reflects cDNA numbering with +1 corresponding to the A of the ATG translation initiation codon in the reference sequences NM_006306.2 (for *SMC1A*), NM_005445.3 (for *SMC3*), NM_012447.2 (for *STAG3*), NM_015384.3 (for *NIPBL*) according to journal guidelines (www.hgvs.org/mutnomen). The initiation codon is codon 1.