Personalized Stem Cell Therapy to Correct Corneal Defects Due to a Unique Homozygous-Heterozygous Mosaicism of Ectrodactyly-Ectodermal Dysplasia-Clefting Syndrome
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ABSTRACT

Ectrodactyly-ectodermal dysplasia-clefting (EEC) syndrome is a rare autosomal dominant disease caused by mutations in the p63 gene. To date, approximately 40 different p63 mutations have been identified, all heterozygous. No definitive treatments are available to counteract and resolve the progressive corneal degeneration due to a premature aging of limbal epithelial stem cells. Here, we describe a unique case of a young female patient, aged 18 years, with EEC and corneal dysfunction, who was, surprisingly, homozygous for a novel and de novo R311K missense mutation in the p63 gene. A detailed analysis of the degree of somatic mosaicism in leukocytes from peripheral blood and oral mucosal epithelial stem cells (OMESCs) from biopsies of buccal mucosa showed that approximately 80% were homozygous mutant cells and 20% were heterozygous. Cytogenetic and molecular analyses excluded genomic alterations, thus suggesting a de novo mutation followed by an allelic gene conversion of the wild-type allele by de novo mutant allele as a possible mechanism to explain the homozygous condition. R311K-p63 OMESCs were expanded in vitro and heterozygous holoclones selected following clonal analysis. These R311K-p63 OMESCs were able to generate well-organized and stratified epithelia in vitro, resembling the features of healthy tissues. This study supports the rationale for the development of cultured autologous oral mucosal epithelial stem cell sheets obtained by selected heterozygous R311K-p63 stem cells, as an effective and personalized therapy for reconstructing the ocular surface of this unique case of EEC syndrome, thus bypassing gene therapy approaches.

SIGNIFICANCE

This case demonstrates that in a somatic mosaicism context, a novel homozygous mutation in the p63 gene can arise as a consequence of an allelic gene conversion event, subsequent to a de novo mutation. The heterozygous mutant R311K-p63 stem cells can be isolated by means of clonal analysis and given their good regenerative capacity, they may be used to successfully correct the corneal defects present in this unique case of ectrodactyly-ectodermal dysplasia-clefting syndrome.

INTRODUCTION

Ectrodactyly-ectodermal dysplasia-clefting (EEC) syndrome (MIM#604292) is an autosomal dominant disease, clinically characterized by limb defects, orofacial clefting, ectodermal dysplasia, and ocular defects. It is related to mutations of the transcription factor p63, a master regulator of gene expression for squamous epithelial proliferation, differentiation, and maintenance. Mutations in p63 account for 98% of patients with typical EEC features and the majority are heterozygous missense mutations located in the DNA-binding domain [1]. To date, approximately 40 different pathogenic p63 mutations have been identified in EEC syndrome [2]. Nearly 90% of these mutations involve 5 arginine residues in the DNA-binding domain: p.R204, p.R227, p.R279, p.R280, and p.R304 [3, 4]. The arginine codons at 304 and 279 are mutational hotspots [4, 5]. Most of cases are sporadic (approximately 70%), related to de novo mutations frequently arising during early-stage development. Moreover, germline mosaicism cases
were also described [6]. Familial cases show an autosomal dominant inheritance with variable penetrance. The incidence in the population is 1:900,000, according to the Italian Ministry of Health. We recently found that the major cause of visual morbidity in EEC syndrome is due to a premature ageing and progressive deficiency of limbal stem cells, causing corneal blindness [4–6]. No definitive cures are currently available to treat or at least arrest the progression of these corneal disorders.

Limbal stem cell deficiency (LSCD) is characterized by conjunctival epithelial ingrowth, neovascularization, chronic inflammation, opacification, recurrent corneal erosion, persistent ulcers, destruction of basement membrane components, and fibrous tissue ingrowth [4]. Many causes can lead to severe LSCD, including physical-chemical traumas, infections, irradiations, chronic therapies, autoimmune, congenital, and diseases such as aniridia and EEC syndrome [7]. Transplantation of cultured, autologous limbal epithelial cell sheets (CALECS) has shown to be a valid and successful treatment for acquired unilateral LSCD but not applicable in cases with bilateral LSCD, which are characterized by complete stem-cell deficiency in both eyes [8, 9]. Transplantation of allogenic limbus is feasible but requires immunosuppressive treatments and has a success rate that tends to decrease gradually over time (graft survival rate of 40% at 1 year and 33% at 2 years) [10]. For patients with total and bilateral LSCD, transplantation of cultured autologous oral mucosal epithelial stem cell sheets (CAOMESCs) represents the only effective alternative for reconstructing the ocular surface [11–13]. Nevertheless, for patients with EEC who have a total bilateral LSCD resulting from a genetic alteration, the ocular pathology should be treated by making use of gene therapy-based approaches able to disrupt the deleterious effects of the p63 mutation.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Cell Culture and Clonal Analysis**

Primary human keratinocytes were isolated from fresh oral mucosal biopsies of healthy subjects or patients with EEC syndrome after an informed consent form was signed. The research study and the informed consent forms were approved by the Venetian Ethical Committee for Clinical Research Studies (Prot. 2009/77661, dated November 19, 2009). Once isolated, cells were cultivated onto a feeder layer of lethally irradiated murine 3T3-J2 fibroblasts, as previously described [9]. Subconfluent primary cultures were passaged, serially diluted to obtain 0.5 cells per well, and plated into 96-well plates. The obtained clones were passaged, serially diluted to obtain 0.5 cells per well, and plated into a 24-well plate and transfected 24 hours later. Lipofectamine 2000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was used as transfecting agent. A plasmid containing the luciferase gene under the control of the K14 promoter and expression vectors encoding for WT-, R311K-, R311G-, R304Q-, and R279H-DNp63a were used. When needed, the pcDNA empty vector (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was added to reach the total amount of DNA (500 ng) used in each transfection. In all cases, 10 ng of Renilla luciferase vector (pRL-CMV; Promega, Madison, WI, http://www.promega.com) was cotransfected as a control of the transfection efficiency. Cells were transfected at 80%–90% confluence and incubated at 37°C for 6 hours before medium change. Luciferase activities of cellular extracts were measured by using a dual luciferase reporter assay system (Promega) and light emission was measured over 1 and 5 seconds using a Modulus Microplate Reader luminometer (Promega). All experiments were performed in triplicate.

**Luciferase Reporter Assay**

For the luciferase assay, HEK293T cells were plated at density of 2 × 10⁵ cells per well in a 24-well plate and transfected 24 hours later. DNA was extracted directly from oral mucosal biopsy or from the primary culture by using the DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany, https://www.qiagen.com), following the manufacturer’s instructions and procedures. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was performed on the
genomic DNA extracted from tissue or cells, using forward and reverse primers designed to amplify exons 8 (61.6°C; amplicon length: 351 base pairs).

**Sanger Sequencing**

PCR products (6 ml) were submitted to a phase of the BigDye Terminator kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific). BigDye mix contained 2 ml of buffer, 2 ml of terminators, and 5 ml of primer mix (1 mM). The sequencing program was as follows: a first step of 96°C for 3 s, continued with 30 cycles of 96°C for 10 s, 50°C for 5 s, and 60°C for 4 s. After the BigDye treatment, sequencing was performed according to the Sanger method.

**cDNA Synthesis and Quantitative Real-Time PCR**

To calculate the copy number of transcript molecules, normalized for glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH) in each OMESC clone (n = 24) and autologous limbal stem cell grafts (n = 21), the single-stranded cDNAs were subjected to quantitative real-time PCR (qPCR). A standard curve method was used and reactions carried out in an Applied Biosystems 7800 Real-Time PCR System (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The sequences of the primers and probes are as follows:

- **p63-Exon 8 FW**: 5′-GGTAGATCCAGGGGACCTTC-3′
- **p63-Exon 8 Rev**: 5′-TTCTCACTGGCCTGAGGG-3′
- **GAPDH FW**: 5′-CCACTCCCTCACCTTGAGC-3′
- **GAPDH Rev**: 5′-CATGGGATCCACACCTG-3′
- **GAPDH probe**: 5′-TET-TTGCCCTCAACGCCACCCTT-TAMRA-3′
- **Seq FW**: 5′-GACTGACACCTCTATTGTGTG-3′
- **Seq Rev**: 5′-GCCGTGAGTAATGCTCAATCTG-3′
- **ΔNp63α FW**: 5′-GCCATGTCAAGTTTCAGGAG-3′
- **ΔNp63α Rev**: 5′-CCACCTGAGTAATGCTCAATCTG-3′
- **ΔNp63α probe**: 5′-FAM-GGACTATTTCACGACCCAGG-BHQ1-3′

**Molecular Cytogenetics**

Bacterial artificial chromosome (BAC) genomic clones were obtained from Source BioScience (Berlin, Germany, http://www.us.sourcebioscience.com) and labeled by random priming (BioPrime DNA labeling system; Thermo Fisher Scientific) with Biotin-14-dCTP (Thermo Fisher Scientific) or digoxigenin-11-dUTP. Molecular combing analysis was performed as previously described [15]. Briefly, R311K keratinocytes were harvested and immobilized in agarose plugs. High-molecular-weight DNA obtained after β-agarase I digestion (3 U per 1–2 plugs; EuroClone, Milan, Italy) in 0.1 M MES, pH 6.5, was combed on silanized microscope slides by using the Cytospin III (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Chromosome spreads were obtained after agarase I digestion (3 U per 1 ml) and autologous limbal stem cell grafts (n = 21), the single-stranded cDNAs were subjected to quantitative real-time PCR (qPCR). A standard curve method was used and reactions carried out in an Applied Biosystems 7800 Real-Time PCR System (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The sequences of the primers and probes are as follows:

- **ΔNp63α FW**: 5′-GCCATGTCAAGTTTCAGGAG-3′
- **ΔNp63α Rev**: 5′-CCACCTGAGTAATGCTCAATCTG-3′
- **ΔNp63α probe**: 5′-FAM-GGACTATTTCACGACCCAGG-BHQ1-3′

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Here we report a singular and rare case of EEC syndrome (Fig. 1) associated with severe conjunctivalization of the cornea and symblepharon (Fig. 1F, 1G). The clinical setting was confirmed through impression cytology analysis using antibodies against cytokeratin (CK) 12 and mucin 1 (MUC1) (Fig. 1H) [17]. The genetic analysis showed that the patient was unexpectedly homozygous for a novel and de novo missense mutation in the p63 gene, R311K. The homozygous mutation detected in this patient occurred in codon 311 at nucleotide 1049 and caused the conversion from arginine to lysine in exon 8 (R311K; AGA > AAA; c.1049G > A) (Fig. 2A). Sequencing of the corresponding region in the DNAs obtained from the parents, brother, and paternal sperm (Fig. 2A) confirmed that the mutation was de novo. The assessment of paternity through a 16-microsatellite marker analysis (D8S1179, D21S11, D7S820, CSF1PO, D5S1358, TH01, D13S317, D16S539, D21S11, D19S433, VWA, TPOX, D18S51, amelogenin, D5S818, FGA), elaborated by PatCan2 software (Cantabria, Spain, https://patcan.es), showed a 99.999989515% compatibility (data not shown). The involved amino acid has a high degree of phylogenetic conservation (Fig. 2B), and the mutation is located in the same position as another EEC causative mutation, p.R311G, which was previously described [18]. The position of the mutation is given according to the original published TA-p63α sequence (GenBank accession no. AF075430), which does not enclose the 39 additional amino acids at the N-terminus, as reported by GenBank (accession no. AF091627; gi:3695081) [19].

An in-depth analysis of the sequence chromatogram revealed a small G peak, corresponding to the wild-type sequence, below
the A peak, corresponding to the mutant sequence (Fig. 2A). The faint G peak was detectable in all the sequence chromatograms, probably because of a low level of mosaicism, both in leukocytes from the peripheral blood and in OMECs from biopsy specimens of buccal mucosa.

To better explore and obtain an estimate of the degree of mosaicism, we cloned the PCR products from both leukocytes and OMECs. Sequence analysis of 100 clones showed that approximately 90% of the clones were derived from the mutant allele, whereas 10% of clones represented the normal allele (Fig. 2A). This result suggested a somatic mosaicism in which 80% of the patient cells carry 2 mutant alleles and, thus, are homozygous, and approximately 20% are heterozygous for the wild-type and mutant alleles. Homozygous mutations in dominant disorders are frequently lethal in embryos. Consistent with this, \( p63 \)-null mice die soon after birth [20, 21], and no other mutation in the \( p63 \) gene has ever been found in a homozygous condition. We envisage that when the mutation arises in heterozygosity, as all the well-characterized EEC causative mutations (R279H, R304Q, and R311G), a milder form of EEC syndrome is generated. In silico analysis (Fig. 2C-2E) supported this hypothesis and the R311K mutation was still able to bind the \( p63 \) site on the genomic DNA. Meanwhile, the severe heterozygous EEC-causing mutation, such as R311G, lost this capacity.

To determine the transactivation capacity of the mutated sequences (and, therefore, the severity of a specific \( p63 \) mutation), a luciferase assay was developed by transfecting cell lines with either wild-type or mutant \( p63 \) sequences together with a reporter construct containing the luciferase gene under the control of the K14 promoter. The luciferase assay showed a reduced R311K-\( p63 \) transcriptional activity on the \( p63 \) specific promoter, thus confirming its pathogenicity, but a milder effect in the heterozygous state (Fig. 2F).

To find a possible explanation, cytogenetic and molecular analyses were performed. Neither parent carried the R311K mutation. By molecular cytogenetics (Fig. 3A-3C), we excluded the presence of large genomic rearrangements, deletions, or duplications in R311K-\( p63 \) OMECs [15, 16]. The resolution of the analysis on DNA extended fibers (molecular combing; Fig. 3A, 3B) is 5 kb; interphase FISH with 2 BAC clones closely mapping at \( p63 \) and a distal probe mapping in the short arm of chromosome 3 had a resolution of 100 kb (Fig. 3A, 3C). The presence of genomic rearrangements, deletions, or duplications within the \( p63 \) gene was excluded by quantitative \( p63 \)-specific real-time PCR analysis [22] (Fig. 3D). Our overall hypothesis is, therefore, that a likely mechanism explaining the homozgyous status of the patient could be tracked back to a de novo mutation followed by an allelic gene conversion of the wild-type allele by the de novo mutant.
allele in the \(p63\) gene (Fig. 3E). Forty-two single nucleotide polymorphisms analyzed in the exon 8 flanking the mutation were monomorphic in both parents (data not shown) and, therefore, we were unable to definitively confirm allelic gene conversion, likely because of the small size of the gene conversion event \([23, 24]\). To our knowledge, this is the first report describing these pathogenetic events in the \(p63\) gene.

R311K-\(p63\) OMESCs were characterized, ex vivo expanded, and analyzed by clonal analysis (Fig. 4A). Of approximately 400 clones, a CFE assay showed that only 24 had a high clonogenic ability and proliferative potential in vitro; in addition, at least 6 of these resulted as holoclones (data not shown) \([25]\). Results from the sequencing analysis demonstrated that all the 24 clones were heterozygous (Fig. 4B), thus suggesting a selective growth advantage of the heterozygous stem cells compared with the homozygous ones. We were unable to obtain homozygous clonogenic cells. Stem cell content evaluated by quantifying \(D\)Np63\(a\) expression through real-time qPCR \([9, 26, 27]\) was comparable to that observed in CALECSs successfully transplanted in patients with LSCD caused by traumatic events (Fig. 4C).

Finally, to test the regenerative ability of the selected R311K-\(p63\) OMESCs carrying the hypomorphic allele, we set up organotypic cultures derived by pooling all R311K-\(p63\) heterozygous holoclones (HHs) grown on a HKL model \([14]\) (Fig. 4D). Compared with OMESCs from healthy (H-OMESCs; \(n = 3\)) and patients with EEC (EEC-OMESCs; \(n = 2\), with severe heterozygous p.R279H and p.R304Q \(p63\) mutations), epithelia generated by p.R311K-\(p63\) HHs were more similar to H-OMESCs and well organized into

---

**Figure 2.** Genotype and functional characterization of R311K-\(p63\) mutation. (A): Schematic representation of R311K-\(p63\) mutation in the patient’s family. The chromatograms of exon 8 of the \(p63\) gene in the father’s spermatoocytes and leukocytes and in the mother’s leukocytes are shown at the top. The wild-type sequence is shown; the red arrows indicate the base involved in the point mutation. The chromatograms of exon 8 of the \(p63\) gene in the brother’s leukocytes and in the patient’s leukocytes and OMESCs are shown in the lower part of this panel. The sequence from the brother’s cells indicates the wild-type pattern; those of the patient with ectrodactyly-ectodermal dysplasia-clefting (EEC) show the G-to-A transition at nucleotide position 1049 (in red), resulting in the R311K codon. The low wild-type G peak (*) below the mutant A peak is indicative of a mosaicism condition. The sequencing of single molecules of exon 8 of the patient, amplified from leukocytes and OMESCs by PCR and cloned into a TOPO vector, shows the presence of 90% of mutated and 10% of wild-type PCR fragments. (B): Alignment of \(p63\) protein sequence from different species. (C–E): Three-dimensional model of \(D\)Np63\(a\) protein. The arginine in the wild-type form of the \(p63\) protein can bind DNA in G7 through 2 hydrogen bonds and the amino acid in D312 through a hydrogen bond \(\text{(C)}\). The glycine in the same position (311), clinically responsible for a severe EEC syndrome, leads to a complete loss of the ability to bind the DNA and flanking amino acid \(\text{(E)}\). Meanwhile, the lysine loses the 3 hydrogen bonds of the wild-type protein but still binds DNA, acquiring a hydrogen bond in A14 on the consensus DNA-binding site \(\text{(D)}\). (F): Transactivation potential of \(D\)Np63\(a\) protein and of its EEC mutants determined by transient transfection into HEK293T cells \([34]\). Keratin-14 promoter, cloned in the luciferase reporter vector, was cotransfected along with an empty expression vector (pcDNA 3.1) or the indicated \(D\)Np63\(a\) expressing plasmid: wild-type (WT), DNA-binding domain mutants (R279H; R311K; R311G; R304Q), and a 1:1 combination of WT and R311K mutant. Transfection efficiency was normalized with a Renilla reporter vector. The result is the mean of four independent experiments. Abbreviations: OMESCs, oral mucosal epithelial stem cells; PCR, polymerase chain reaction.
(a) basal column-shaped cells expressing ΔNp63α; (b) suprabasal cuboid wing cells, expressing cK3; and (c) flat, squamous, superficial terminally differentiated cells, as indicated by the expression of involucrin. The basal cuboidal cell layer was firmly attached to the underlying extracellular matrix and to the basement membrane through laminin β3. In sharp contrast, tissues generated from R279H and R304Q-p63 OMESCs showed defects in both stratification and differentiation, thus resulting in severe tissue hypoplasia and lack of proper tissue polarity (Fig. 4D), consistent with previous reports [28–35]. Collectively, these results strongly support the potential clinical use of p.R311K-p63 HHs for the development of CAOMESCs, to reconstruct the ocular surface of this unique case of EEC syndrome.

In this study, we report the first and only case, to our knowledge, of an 18-year-old patient with EEC with a homozygous mutation in the p63 gene. To our knowledge, this patient shows the most severe ocular phenotype. The fact that the patient survived despite having a homozygous mutation in the p63 gene is intriguing, thus predicting a milder severity of this mutation when in the heterozygous state. Arginine and lysine are both positive cationic and both are polar amino acids, thus suggesting that, in some cases, their exchange could be well tolerated. Our hypothesis is that the somatic mosaicism combined with (a) the homozygosity for a hypomorphic allele rather than a loss-of-function allele and (b) the heterozygosity consisting of at least 20% of cells, contributed to the survival of
the patient, despite what would otherwise represent a lethal condition.

**CONCLUSION**

The novelty and importance of this study are related to the ability to isolate and recover stem cells heterozygous for p63, which appear to have an extraordinary regenerative capacity comparable to that of healthy cells, thus representing a valuable source for starting a customized clinical trial for this unique case of EEC syndrome based solely on epithelial stem cell manipulation.

Patients with LSCD have become quite optimistic after the approval of Holoclar (Holostem Terapie Avanzate, Modena, Italy, http://www.holostem.com), the first advanced-therapy medicinal product containing stem cells to be used for the treatment of moderate to severe LSCD, by the European Medicines Agency. Holoclar consists of cells taken from the patient’s limbus (at the edge of the cornea) and then grown in a laboratory so that they can be used to repair the damaged corneal surface in cases of LSCD caused by alkali burns and similar traumatic events. Likewise, OMESCs therapy is becoming an advanced and valid clinical practice, used in severe bilateral cases of ocular surface reconstruction.

This study (a) highlights and emphasizes the potential of regenerative and personalized medicine, obtained through the development of CAOMESCs, to reconstruct the ocular surface of this unique case of EEC syndrome, and (b) demonstrates a proof-of-principle approach, based only on stem cell strategy, that bypassing gene therapy approaches provides evidence of the feasibility of an innovative strategy to correct a severe corneal pathology.
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