© Indian Academy of Sciences

REVIEW ARTICLE

X-chromosome inactivation: implications in human disease

GUILHERME PEREIRA[1] and SOFIA DÓRIA[2,3]*

[1]*Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal*
[2]*Genetics Service, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Pathology, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal*
[3]*I3S - Instituto de Investigação e Inovação em Saúde, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal*
*For correspondence. E-mail: sdoria@med.up.pt.

Abstract. X-chromosome inactivation (XCI) is a process involved in the pathogenesis of several diseases. In this mini review, we discuss the known mechanisms associated with XCI, when and how does it initiate, spreads and maintain, as well as the mechanisms that allow some genes to escape from it. We address the skewed XCI, condition in which the process are not fully randomized and its consequences to the phenotype of some pathologies. We debate about the known pathologies implicated, including X unbalanced rearrangements, X-autosomal balanced translocations, Turner and Klinefelter syndromes and also for X-linked diseases and its consequences in males and females. Some pathologies are discussed more in detail such as intellectual disability with a recognized relationship with XCI. Finally, possible future implications of genomic therapy and treatment of patients and list of areas that need further research on this topic are addressed.

Keywords. X-chromosome inactivation; X-linked diseases; *XIST* gene; skewed inactivation; X chromosome rearrangements.

Introduction

In humans, female cells carry two X-chromosomes, whereas male cells have only one X chromosome plus a Y chromosome. Y chromosome contains less genetic material (~ 70 genes) than the X chromosome (~ 900–1500) (Disteche 2016). This contributes to a greater imbalance between men and women regarding genes, imbalance that has two mechanisms for compensation: X chromosome upregulation or X chromosome inactivation (XCI) (Fang *et al.* 2019).

Focusing on XCI, the first hypothesis was formulated by Mary Lyon in 1961, and it consisted on 'that mosaic phenotype is due to the inactivation of one or other X chromosome early in embryonic development' (Disteche and Berletch 2015). This reasoning was proven to be accurate, first based on mice, and later confirmed as a law in all mammals. The so-called Lyon Law is still the most important contribute to this topic, more than 50 years after its formulation.

XCI happens during early female embryonic development (Monk *et al.* 1987; Disteche and Berletch 2015) and starts shortly after embryo implantation (Fang *et al.* 2019). The cell's lineage maintain the initial chosen chromosome (either the paternal or the maternal X chromosome) throughout the development until the adulthood (Fang *et al.* 2019) while the other is silenced resulting in the so-called Barr body (Galupa and Heard 2018), a condensed heteropycnotic structure in the interphase nuclei of female cells (Disteche and Berletch 2015). This provides dosage compensation for eutherians between the sexes (Dixon-McDougall and Brown 2016).

Logically, XCI randomness creates a coexistence between both chromosomes activated of an approximate ratio of 1:1. This is extremely relevant to phenotypic changes, as mutations that could lead to serious complications in males are compensated by another chromosome in 50% of the female cells (Cantone and Fisher 2017). This process of randomness follows a normal distribution, what almost mandatorily creates examples of very unbalanced ratios. This process is called 'skewing of XCI', and the extreme cases (over 90% of the cells with inactivation of the same chromosome) skewed X-chromosome inactivation (Cantone and Fisher 2017). Nonrandom inactivation also exists in special cases where a

group of cells has a proliferative advantage (or disadvantage) based on X-chromosome mutations, what causes one to outgrow the other.

It is also important to refer that XCI is not a permanent state, as it can be reversed (Payer 2016). It is physiologic for example when it happens on haploid cells (like the spermatozoid—the paternal X is silenced until fertilization happens), but it can also be pathological (in some congenital or acquired diseases) (Disteche and Berletch 2015). Age-related X reactivation may also happen, and that this process could be related to neurological and oncological problems (Leppig *et al.* 2001).

XCI regulation and function

XCI comprises of a series of highly organized events that result in the transcriptional silence of one of the two female X chromosomes. The process starts with the counting and choosing of the X-chromosome that will be silenced followed by three steps referred usually as XCI initiation, XCI spreading and XCI maintenance.

The initiation of XCI is controlled by a regulatory locus named X-inactivation centre (Xic) that contains clustered genes and regulatory sequences involved in the inactivation process. It is defined as the region that is necessary and sufficient to trigger XCI when present in two copies (Galupa and Heard 2018). The proximal limit of the human X-inactivation centre (XIC) has been localized between Xq13.1 and Xq13.2 chromosome region.

This region was found to have a gene that encodes non-coding RNA (lncRNA), named X-inactive specific transcript *(XIST)* that is transcribed only from the future inactive X chromosome (Xi). The process of silencing is still largely unknown but according to literature, *XIST* RNA may spread along the Xi beginning a cascade of epigenetic changes that results in the formation of the Barr body (Pinter *et al.* 2012; Payer 2016; Posynick and Brown 2019). Without a functional *XIST* gene, there is no X-chromosome inactivation, and its partial decrease of activity in one group of cells (due to a mutation in X-chromosome) causes an unbalance that can lead to nonrandom inactivation (Bicocchi *et al.* 2005).

The choice of the X chromosome that becomes silenced is also molecularly influenced: X controlling element (Xce) locus is fundamental to that process, even if there are no certainty about how it works. Even though, randomness is also an important component of the inactivation (Monkhorst *et al.* 2008). Epigenetics are also relevant, and even some degree of heritable gene silencing could influence this process (Disteche and Berletch 2015).

XCI spreading is a not well-known process but following the most recent studies, XIST spreads in *cis* across the inactive chromosome, recruiting polycomb repressive complex 2 (PRC2) and spreading it due to the formation of a silent nuclear compartment, with repressive chromatin modifications, which the most known may be H3K27me3

(Engreitz *et al.* 2013). XIST RNA recruits several proteins, namely SHARP, which help in this process, as SHARP recruits SMRT, a protein that activates the histone deacetylase HDAC3 for silencing. Several studies also refer to the importance of A-repeat within the *XIST* gene, as it interacts both as a silencing component, and as a binding interactors (Disteche and Berletch 2015).

As technology improves, studying XCI spreading is extremely relevant as it may be possible in future to correct trisomy 21 by insertion of a XIST transgene on chromosome 21, offering help to individuals with Down's syndrome (or other trisomies). This is 'the major first step towards chromosome therapy', and it is certainly a matter that deserves more studies (Jiang *et al.* 2013).

The maintenance of gene silencing in X-inactivation is a complex phenomenon that involves the interaction of many different cellular mechanisms and pathways. Further, recent studies showed that XCI is not as stable as previously thought. Reactivation of some Xi genes was observed in normal and diseases tissues, e.g., upon ageing, in autoimmune diseases and cancer (Bicocchi *et al.* 2005). The normal progression of this process is not the same in every cell lineage: it has been reported that immune cells, e.g., have a diverse process of XCI maintenance, what actually has been reported as a possible cause of the well-known imbalance in autoimmune diseases between men and women (Sierra and Anguera 2019).

One of the most intriguing questions regarding X inactivation is how (and why) some loci are able to escape gene silencing. In human, up to 25% of X-linked genes can escape from XCI - 15% of them constitutively and about 10% of them variably between individuals (Galupa and Heard 2018). This biallelic expression results in a higher dosage of these genes in females suggesting that these genes might have female-specific roles (Berletch *et al.* 2011).

Historically, we know that there are several different pathways that lead to XCI, and some of the genes involved in this process are the same in multiple species. The most popular explanation for why this process started comes from the fact that there was a need to have Y homology in the X-chromosome, for questions of balance. However, half or more than half of the escaping genes have no Y correspondence. This difference is probably explained simplistically by Darwinism—the cases that XCI escape gave reproductive advantage to the female probably created this difference (Posynick and Brown 2019).

We can also relate several elements that benefit or reduce this escape. Regions without silencing elements, like X added region (XAR), have more escaping genes, while regions that have less Y homology have subsequently more presence of heterochromatin and are more silenced.

These genes that escape X-inactivation are responsible for many of the different phenotypes that some diseases can present. As such, and due to the fact that we have drawn a clear correlation between DNA methylation and escape from XCI (Payer 2016; Halmai *et al.* 2020), we can now project

that understanding this can have a lot of potential to create innovative ways of treatment for people who suffer from this X-linked disorders (Halmai *et al.* 2020).

XCI: consequences for human diseases

The existence of skewed X-chromosome inactivation allows the development of multiple diseases, in noncommon forms, mainly X-linked diseases in women.

X-chromosome numerical and structural abnormalities

The occurrence of XCI has many implications in both numerical and structural abnormalities of the X-chromosome.

XCI has a protective effect in human chromosome aneuploidies, such as Turner syndrome (X) and Klinefelter syndrome (XXY), because it balances the chromosomes causing a softer, milder disease in comparison with autosomal trisomies (the few tolerated have severe consequences) (Cantone and Fisher 2017). Individuals with Turner syndrome have low stature, as the gene *SHOX* partially escape inactivation in the Xi of women, giving them an average stature (Blaschke and Rappold 2006; Disteche and Berletch 2015).

In the case of X-autosome balanced translocations, there is an interesting order of events regarding XCI: the normal X chromosome tends to be inactivated (75%), giving usually a normal phenotype. However, two situations can happen: even an initiation point of XCI is imprinted just before the translocation, what actually silences also the translocated gene (what could lead to different pathologies), or the skewed XCI happens on the translocated chromosome (25%) of females, which leads to a functional X disomy and autosomal monosomy (Mattei *et al.* 1982). One example was reported in a girl carrier of a translocation between X and 11 chromosomes and that have a phenotype compatible with Coffin–Lowry syndrome (Yamoto *et al.* 2020). In unbalanced translocations, if the abnormal X is inactivated, the inactivation spreads to the autosomal region, and the phenotype is often abnormal. Other structural abnormalities such as X chromosome deletions, or extra X rings may be tolerated because of the preferential inactivation of the abnormal X chromosome, being random XCI more associated with an abnormal phenotype.

X-linked diseases

A correlation between intellectual disability (ID) and skewed XCI has been established (Plenge *et al.* 2002; Gieldon *et al.* 2017). In males (with only one copy of X-chromosome), ID in autism spectrum syndromes and other mental impairment diseases, are way more prevalent. However, skewed XCI can cause intermediate or even almost complete phenotypes of these diseases in women. It has been reported that deletions of *KDM5C* or *IQSEC2* cause ID, however, while in men they are normally severe, in women it depends on dosage sensitivity: women with skewed or extremely skewed X-chromosome inactivation have more clinical severe consequences. *KDM6A* gene (responsible for Kabuki syndrome) also have effects related with the dosage, and as such, have great impact in women with skewed X-chromosome inactivation (Disteche and Berletch 2015). Other examples are ATR-X, Lowe oculocerebrorenal syndrome, Allan–Herdon–Dudley syndrome and autism spectrum diseases (Aarabi *et al.* 2019).

With reference to systemic diseases, a good example is Fabry disease, a rare metabolic disease caused by the deficient activity of α-galactosidase A, which usually affects males in a severe way, while women range from asymptomatic (the majority) to severely affected, in cases relatable to the existence of skewed X-chromosome inactivation (Echevarria *et al.* 2016).

Other example could be the skin diseases: incontinentia pigmenti, focal dermal hypoplasia, Conradi–Hünermann–Happle syndrome, oral–facial–digital syndrome type 1 or microphthalmia, dermal aplasia and sclerocornea (MIDAS) syndrome are all lethal X-linked traits that not only occur in men, but also in women with skewed XCI. There are also other nonlethal pathologies associated, such as hypohidrotic ectodermal dysplasia of Christ–Siemens–Touraine, ichthyosis follicularis–alopecia–photophobia (IFAP).

Another interesting disease that could make the woman range from simply being carrier to have serious consequences is haemophilia. Skewed X-chromosome inactivation can create serious consequences, reducing the clotting factor in the blood to similar level in men who are affected by the disease (Shoukat *et al.* 2020).

There are also some case reports of situations where skewed or highly skewed X-chromosome inactivation could lead to most normal phenotypes: the gene *SHOX*, deleted in Leri-Weill dyschondrosteosis, can be compensated by the other chromosome (Sun *et al.* 2019).

Another important point is that not only deletions cause disease: a failure of the XCI mechanisms can also cause it: hypomethylation of the X-chromosome, or mutations in the XCI escape system, also cause disease. For example, reactivation of the silenced X-chromosome has been documented in breast or renal cancer (Disteche and Berletch 2015). This hypothesis was also reported for other cancers, but studies in the area are not ample.

It is also relevant to refer a problem to be solved: usually all the studies were done with small cohorts, and there is a little amount of bibliography related to this topic. Moreover, every data should be taken carefully, and more studies with bigger cohorts should be performed to distinguish which diseases are and which are not related to XCI, and what future treatments could be applied in that cases.

Concluding remarks

XCI understanding, namely how it starts, spreads, maintains, and how to escape from it may help us find new genomic therapies that will certainly be fundamental for many genetic diseases, from rare to the most common such as Down syndrome, Turner syndrome or Klinefelter syndrome. Also due to skewed X-chromosome inactivation, many women have different phenotypes of diseases that are X-linked. However, yet a lot of work has to be done on this area, mainly with larger cohorts, and with the exploration of the differences between cell groups, such as immune system cells, and also new methods of treatment, like some that are previously referred, such as transgene insertions.

References

Aarabi M., Kessler E., Madan-Khetarpal S., Surti U., Bellissimo D., Rajkovic A. et al. 2019 Autism spectrum disorder in females with ARHGEF9 alterations and a random pattern of X chromosome inactivation. *Eur. J. Med. Genet.* **62**, 239–242.

Berletch J. B., Yang F., Xu J., Carrel L. and Disteche C. M. 2011 Genes that escape from X inactivation. *Hum. Genet.* **130**, 237–245.

Bicocchi M. P., Migeon B. R., Pasino M., Lanza T., Bottini F., Boeri E. et al. 2005 Familial nonrandom inactivation linked to the X inactivation centre in heterozygotes manifesting haemophilia A. *Eur. J. Hum. Genet.* **13**, 635–640.

Blaschke R. J. and Rappold G. 2006 The pseudoautosomal regions, SHOX and disease. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **16**, 233–239.

Cantone I. and Fisher A. G. 2017 Human X chromosome inactivation and reactivation: implications for cell reprogramming and disease. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.* **372**, 20160358.

Disteche C. and Berletch J. 2015 X-chromosome Inactivation and Escape. *J. Genet.* **94**, 591–598.

Disteche C. 2016 Dosage compensation of the sex chromosomes and autosomes. *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.* **56**, 9–18.

Dixon-McDougall T. and Brown C. 2016 The making of a Barr body: the mosaic of factors that eXIST on the mammalian inactive X chromosome. *Biochem. Cell Biol.* **94**, 56–70.

Echevarria L., Benistan K., Toussaint A., Dubourg O., Hagege A. A., Eladari D. et al. 2016 X-chromosome inactivation in female patients with Fabry disease. *Clin. Genet.* **89**, 44–54.

Engreitz J. M., Pandya-Jones A., McDonel P., Shishkin A., Sirokman K., Surka C. et al. 2013 The Xist lncRNA exploits three-dimensional genome architecture to spread across the X chromosome. *Science* **341**, 1237973.

Fang H., Disteche C. and Berletch J. 2019 X inactivation and escape: epigenetic and structural features. *Front. Cell Dev. Biol.* **7**, 219.

Galupa R. and Heard E. 2018 X-chromosome inactivation: a crossroads between chromosome architecture and gene regulation. *Annu. Rev. Genet.* **52**, 535–566.

Gieldon L., Mackenroth L., Betcheva-Krajcir E., Rump A., Beck-Wödl S., Schallner J. et al. 2017 Skewed X-inactivation in a family with DLG3-associated X-linked intellectual disability. *Am. J. Med. Genet. A* **173**, 2545–2550.

Halmai J. A. N. M., Deng P., Gonzalez C. E., Coggins N. B., Cameron D., Carter J. L. et al. 2020 Artificial escape from XCI by DNA methylation editing of the CDKL5 gene. *Nuclic Acids Res.* **48**, 2372–2387.

Jiang J., Jing Y., Cost G. J., Chiang J. C., Kolpa H. J., Cotton A. M. et al. 2013 Translating dosage compensation to trisomy 21. *Nature* **500**, 296–300.

Leppig K. A. and Disteche C. M. 2001 Ring X and other structural X chromosome abnormalities: X inactivation and phenotype. *Semin. Reprod. Med.* **19**, 147–157.

Mattei M. G., Mattei J. F., Ayme S. and Giraud F. 1982 X-autosome translocations: cytogenetic characteristics and their consequences. *Hum. Genet.* **61**, 295–309.

Monk M., Boubelik M. and Lehnert S. 1987 Temporal and regional changes in DNA methylation in the embryonic, extraembryonic and germ cell lineages during mouse embryo development. *Development* **99**, 371–382.

Monkhorst K., Jonkers I., Rentmeester E., Grosveld F. and Gribnau J. 2008 X inactivation counting and choice is a stochastic process: evidence for involvement of an X-linked activator. *Cell* **132**, 410–421.

Payer B. 2016 Developmental regulation of X-chromosome inactivation. *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.* **56**, 88–99.

Pinter S. F., Sadreyev R. I., Yildirim E., Jeon Y., Ohsumi T. K. and Borowsky M. 2012 Spreading of X chromosome inactivation via a hierarchy of defined Polycomb stations. *Genome. Res.* **22**, 1864–1876.

Plenge R. M., Stevenson R. A., Lubs H. A., Schwartz C. E. and Willard H. F. 2002 Skewed X-chromosome inactivation is a common feature of X-linked mental retardation disorders. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **71**, 168–173.

Posynick B. J. and Brown C. J. 2019 Escape from X-chromosome inactivation: an evolutionary perspective. *Front. Cell Dev. Biol.* **7**, 241.

Sierra I. and Anguera M. C. 2019 Enjoy the silence: X-chromosome inactivation diversity in somatic cells. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **55**, 26–31.

Shoukat H. M. H., Ghous G., Tarar Z. I., Shoukat M. M. and Ajmal N. 2020 Skewed inactivation of X chromosome: a cause of Hemophilia manifestation in carrier females. *Cureus* **12**, e11216.

Sun Y., Luo Y., Qian Y., Chen M., Wang L., Li H. et al. 2019 Heterozygous deletion of the SHOX gene enhancer in two females with clinical heterogeneity associating with skewed XCI and escaping XCI. *Front. Genet.* **10**, 1086.

Yamoto K., Saitsu H., Fujisawa Y., Kato F., Matsubara K., Fukami M. et al. 2020 Coffin-Lowry syndrome in a girl with 46, XX, t(X;11)(p22;p15)dn: Identification of RPS6KA3 disruption by whole genome sequencing. *Clin. Case Rep.* **8**, 1076–1080.