Ferrero GB, Gebbia M, Pilia G, Witte D, Peier A, Hopkin RJ, Craigen WJ, et al (1997) A submicroscopic deletion in Xq26 associated with familial situs ambiguus. Am J Hum Genet 61:395–401

Gebbia M, Ferrero GB, Pilia G, Bassi MT, Aylsworth AS, Bird LM, Penman-Splitt M, et al (1997) X-linked situs abnormalities result from mutations in ZIC3. Nat Genet 17:305–308

Genuardi M, Pomponi M, Sammito V, Bellussi A, Zollino M, Neri G (1993) Split hand/split foot anomaly in a family segregating a balanced translocation with breakpoint on 7q22.1. Am J Med Genet 47:823–831

Gyapay G, Morissette J, Vignal A, Dib C, Fizames C, Millasseau P, Marc S, et al (1994) The 1993–94 Généthon human genetic linkage map. Nat Genet 7:246–339

Herzon F, Murphy S (1980) Normal ciliary ultrastructure in children with Kartagener's syndrome. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 89:81–83

Höglund P, Holmberg C, de la Chapelle A, Kere J (1994) Paternal isodisomy for chromosome 7 is compatible with normal growth and development in a patient with congenital chloride diarrhea. Am J Hum Genet 55:747–752

Hubbard V, Davis P, DiSant'Agnese PA, Gordon P, Schwartz R (1980) Associated growth hormone deficiency and cystic fibrosis: a report of two cases. Am J Dis Child 134:317–319

Hyatt BA, Lohr JL, Yost HJ (1996) Initiation of vertebrate left-right axis formation by maternal *vg1*. Nature 384:62–65

Koiffmann CP, Wajntal A, de Souza DH, Gonzalez CH, Coates MV (1993) Human situs determination and constitution 46,XY,ins (7;8)(q22;q12q24). Am J Med Genet 47:568–569

Kotzot D, Schmitt S, Bernasconi F, Robinson W, Lurie I, Ilyina H, Mehes K, et al (1995) Uniparental disomy 7 in Silver-Russell syndrome and primordial growth retardation. Hum Mol Genet 4:583–587

Langlois S, Yong S, Wilson R, Kwong L, Kalousek D (1995) Prenatal and postnatal growth failure associated with maternal heterodisomy for chromosome 7. J Med Genet 32:871–875

Ledbetter D, Engel E (1995) Uniparental disomy in humans: development of an imprinting map and its implications for prenatal diagnosis. Hum Mol Genet 4:1757–1764

Liang P, Pardee AB (1992) Differential display of eukaryotic messenger RNA by means of the polymerase chain reaction. Science 257:967–971

Liechti-Gallati S, Kraemer R (1995) Cystic fibrosis mutations and immotile cilia syndrome. Clin Genet 47:328–329

Pedersen M (1983) Specific types of abnormal ciliary motility in Kartagener's syndrome and analogous respiratory disorders. Eur J Respir Dis Suppl 64:78–90

Pentao L, Lewis RA, Ledbetter DH, Patel PI, Lupski JR (1992) Maternal uniparental isodisomy of chromosome 14: association with autosomal recessive rod monochromacy. Am J Hum Genet 50:690–699

Preece MA, Price SM, Davies V, Clough L, Stanier P, Trembath RC, Moore GE (1997) Maternal uniparental disomy 7 in Silver-Russell syndrome. J Med Genet 34:6–9

Pulkkinen L, Bullrich F, Czarnecki P, Weiss L, Uitto J (1997) Maternal uniparental disomy of chromosome 1 with reduction to homozygosity of the LAMB3 locus in a patient with Herlitz junctional epidermolysis bullosa. Am J Hum Genet 61:611–619

Quan F, Janas J, Toth-Fejel S, Johnson DB, Wolford JK, Popovich BW (1997) Uniparental disomy of the entire X chromosome in a female with Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Am J Hum Genet 60:160–165

Rutland J, Cole PJ (1980) Non-invasive sampling of nasal cilia for measurement of beat frequency and study of ultrastructure. Lancet 2:564–565

——— (1981) Nasal mucociliary clearance and beat frequency in cystic fibrosis compared with sinusitis and bronchiectasis. Thorax 36:654–658

Spence JE, Perciaccante RG, Grieg GM, Willard HF, Ledbetter DH, Hejtmancik JF, Pollack MS, et al (1988) Uniparental disomy as a mechanism for human genetic disease. Am J Hum Genet 42:217–226

Spotila LD, Sereda L, Prockop DJ (1992) Partial isodisomy for maternal chromosome 7 and short stature in an individual with a mutation at the COL1A2 locus. Am J Hum Genet 51:1396–1405

Teknos TN, Metson R, Chasse T, Balercia G, Dickersin GR (1997) New developments in the diagnosis of Kartagener's syndrome. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 116:68–74

Voss R, Ben-Simon E, Avital A, Godfrey S, Zlotogora J, Dagan J, Tikochinski Y, et al (1989) Isodisomy of chromosome 7 in a patient with cystic fibrosis: could uniparental disomy be common in humans? Am J Hum Genet 45:373–380

Woodage T, Prasad M, Dixon JW, Selby RE, Romain DR, Columbano-Green LM, Graham D, et al (1994) Bloom syndrome and maternal uniparental disomy for chromosome 15. Am J Hum Genet 55:74–80

Address for correspondence and reprints: Dr. William J. Craigen, S821, Department of Molecular and Human Genetics, Baylor College of Medicine, One Baylor Plaza, Houston, TX 77030. E-mail: wcraigen@bcm.tmc.edu

---

Familial Skewed X Inactivation and X-Linked Mutations: Unbalanced X Inactivation is a Powerful Means to Ascertain X-Linked Genes That Affect Cell Proliferation

To the Editor:

We read with great interest the article by Pegoraro et al. (1997) in which they report familial skewed X inactivation associated with a submicroscopic deletion at Xq28. This deletion, which spans ~800 kb near the F8C locus, is transmitted in the expected X-linked fashion through females, but no males have the deletion. Although we agree that the skewed X-inactivation pattern in this family is attributable to the region around or included in the deletion, we disagree with their inter-

pretation of these results and with some assertions that may lead to confusion about the underlying basis for skewed X inactivation in this family.

The authors suggest that the simplest interpretation of their data is that this disorder behaves like an X dominant with lethality in the male fetus. All the evidence supports this hypothesis: The Xq28 deletion is lethal when present in hemizygous males and confers a proliferative disadvantage to cells of heterozygous females in whom the deleted chromosome is active, which explains why these females are clinically normal.

However, Pegoraro et al. (1997) considered the hypothesis of an X-dominant disorder with male lethality inconsistent with their data on the basis that the relevant locus cannot be a genetic or cell lethal, because, if so, affected males would die soon after fertilization. In fact, the time at which a male embryo carrying the deletion would become inviable, or at which the population of mutant cells in the female would be eliminated, depends on the nature of the mutant gene product—when it is needed, in which cells it is expressed, and how detrimental (or advantageous) it is in the presence of wild-type cells in the mosaic population. Clearly, a male with this small deletion might not be aborted before the pregnancy is recognizable; some males with macroscopic deletions of the X chromosome can survive until late gestation or term (Rosenberg et al. 1987; Cremers et al. 1988).

This family resembles those in which selection has been shown to underlie X inactivation. The familial skewing seen with mutations at the incontinentia pigmenti (IP) locus, in cytogenetically normal females, is also associated with recurrent abortion (Migeon et al. 1989; Parrish et al. 1996). However, IP heterozygotes do not eliminate their mutant population of cells as completely as do the heterozygotes in this family, and hence some IP heterozygotes may be clinically abnormal. Large differences in the growth of normal and abnormal cells can result in early loss of disfavored cells, whereas more subtle differences account for progressive loss during the lifetime of the heterozygote (Migeon et al. 1981, 1988). The familial skewed X inactivation associated with adrenoleukodystrophy was also mapped to Xq28, by tight linkage with the G6PD locus (Migeon et al. 1981), and was shown to be attributable to a proliferative advantage of the mutant gene.

Pegoraro et al. (1997) suggest two alternative novel hypotheses to explain their findings: (1) the deleted region in Xq28 is directly involved in the primary mechanisms of X inactivation; or (2) the region is directly responsible for skewing. In either case, the observed skewing is attributed to a gene in Xq28 that determines the choice of X chromosome to inactivate or the ability of an X to inactivate. As Pegoraro et al. (1997) note, there is no evidence in either mouse or human to support

the existence of a such a gene within the deletion at Xq28. In addition, there is uncited evidence (discussed below) that argues against the existence of such a hypothetical locus in Xq28.

There may be multiple *trans*-acting factors involved in the initiation and maintenance of X inactivation. Observations of triploid embryos suggest that these are likely to reside on autosomes (discussed by Jacobs and Migeon 1989). There is no convincing evidence that factors responsible for *cis* inactivation lie outside the X chromosome–inactivation center (XIC) at Xq13.2. Studies of chromosomal deletions and translocations leading to deletions indicate that this segment is the site of the XIC (Therman et al. 1979; Mattei et al. 1981), and all X-linked genes shown to have an effect on choice (Xce) or on inactivation (XIST) lie within this region. Evidence that other regions of the X are unlikely to be relevant in the choice of X to inactivate comes from recent studies of the murine XIC region transfected into male embryonic stem cells, which indicate that the XIC region contains all the genetic information needed for *cis* inactivation of an X chromosome, including choice of inactive X (Lee et al. 1996; Lee and Jaenisch 1997).

None of the reported families with skewed patterns of X inactivation has been shown, convincingly, to involve the mechanisms of X inactivation. Most of them can be explained by mutations or cytogenetic deletions that adversely affect the proliferation of one of the cell populations produced by random X inactivation (reviewed in Belmont 1996). In light of this, it seems that relatively few cases of familial unbalanced X inactivation will be due to mutations causing primary nonrandom inactivation. Although mutations affecting the process of X inactivation are real possibilities, one expects that those severe enough to interfere with X inactivation would be embryonic lethals, because of the functional X disomy. Mutations in the inactivation machinery that are associated with normal phenotypes and two intact X chromosomes are most likely to be the ones that influence only the choice of X to inactivate and therefore would be at the XIST or an Xce-like locus or in other constituents of the XIC. However, even linkage to the XIC or with specific XIST alleles (Plenge et al. 1997) is not sufficient evidence that skewing is in fact attributable to these genes, because it could be due to a hitchhiker effect, resulting from mutations in a close neighbor with potential for cell selection.

We believe that familial skewing, which maps to the X chromosome but is unlinked to the XIC, most likely results from mutations that do not interfere with the inactivation machinery but that affect the proliferation of the cell populations produced following normal random X inactivation. Females who manifest X-recessive diseases provide a powerful means to detect unbalanced X inactivation (Migeon 1993). The corollary is that

skewed patterns of X inactivation, familial or not, provide a powerful means of ascertaining mutations that influence cell proliferation.

Barbara R. Migeon and Camille Haisley-Royster
*Department of Pediatrics and
Center for Medical Genetics
The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
Baltimore*

References

Belmont JW (1996) Genetic control of X inactivation and processes leading to X-inactivation skewing. Am J Hum Genet 58:1101–1108

Cremers FPM, van de Pol TJR, Wieringa B, Hofker MH, Pearson PL, Pfeiffer RA, Mikkelsen M, et al (1988) Molecular analysis of male-viable deletions and duplications allows ordering of 52 DNA probes on proximal Xq. Am J Hum Genet 43:452–461

Jacobs PA, Migeon BR (1989) Studies of X-chromosome inactivation in trisomies. Cytogenet Cell Genet 50:75–77

Lee JT, Jaenisch R (1997) Long-range *cis* effects of ectopic X-inactivation centres on a mouse autosome. Nature 386:275–279

Lee JT, Strauss WM, Dausman JA, Jaenisch R (1996) A 450 kb transgene displays properties of the mammalian X-inactivation center. Cell 86:83–94

Mattei MG, Mattei JF, Vidal I, Giraud F (1981) Structural anomalies of the X chromosome and inactivation center. Hum Genet 56:401–408

Migeon BR (1993) The postulated X-inactivation center at Xq27 is most reasonably explained by ascertainment bias: heterozygous expression of recessive mutations is a powerful means of detecting unbalanced X inactivation. Am J Hum Genet 52:431–432

Migeon BR, Axelman J, Jan de Beur S, Valle D, Mitchell GA, Rosenbaum KN (1989) Selection against lethal alleles in females heterozygous for incontinentia pigmenti. Am J Hum Genet 44:100–106

Migeon BR, Moser HW, Moser AB, Sprenkle JA, Sillence D, Norum RA (1981) Adrenoleukodystrophy: evidence for X-linkage, inactivation and selection favoring the mutant allele in heterozygous cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 78:5066–5070

Parrish JE, Scheuerle AE, Lewis RA, Levy ML, Nelson DL (1996) Selection against mutant alleles in blood leukocytes is a consistent feature in incontinentia pigmenti type 2. Hum Mol Genet 5:1777–1783

Pegoraro E, Whitaker J, Mowery-Rushton P, Surti U, Lanasa M, Hoffman EP (1997) Familial skewed X inactivation: a molecular trait associated with high spontaneous-abortion rate maps to Xq28. Am J Hum Genet 61:160–170

Plenge RM, Hendrich BD, Schwartz C, Arena F, Naumova A, Sapienza C, Winter R, et al (1997) A promoter mutation in the XIST gene in two unrelated families with skewed X-chromosome inactivation. Nat Genet 17:353–356

Rosenberg T, Niebuhr E, Yang H-M, Parving A, Schwartz M (1987) Choroideremia, congenital deafness and mental re-

tardation in a family with an X chromosomal deletion. Ophthalmic Paediatr Genet 8:139–143

Therman E, Sarto GE, Palmer CG, Kallio H, Denniston C (1979) Position of the human X inactivation center on Xq. Hum Genet 50:59–64

Address for correspondence and reprints: Dr. Barbara R. Migeon, CMSC 10-04, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, 600 North Wolfe Street, Baltimore, MD 21287-3914. E-mail: bmigeon@welchlink.welch.jhu.edu

———

Reply to Migeon and Haisley-Royster

To the Editor:
We thank Drs. Migeon and Haisley-Royster (1998 [in this issue]) for their interest in our research. We are, however, a bit puzzled by their letter to the editor, since they write that they disagree with the interpretation of our results yet then restate what was already written in our previously published article (Pegoraro et al. 1997).

The 50-member pedigree that we reported showed an X-linked dominant disorder with male lethality. There is no question of this fact, because we found a deletion mutation of Xq28 associated with skewed X inactivation and recurrent pregnancy loss (LOD = 6.92). The deletion included the factor VIII gene, yet there were no males from 50 females with factor VIII deficiency, again clearly proving that this family had an X-linked dominant disorder with male lethality.

Drs. Migeon and Haisley-Royster appear to wish to address two issues: (1) interpretation of the likely mechanisms that would cause X-inactivation skewing in the females in this family; and (2) transcriptional timing of the deleted gene or gene products in Xq28 and the observed effect on miscarriage detection. There is very little to disagree with in Drs. Migeon and Haisley-Royster's interpretation of our results; they suggest that a growth disadvantage is probably playing a role, which is precisely what we stated in our discussion. We, too, feel that growth disadvantage is the most likely mechanism causing skewing of X-chromosome inactivation. However, in the absence of characterization of the causative genes in Xq28, it seems unreasonable to dismiss the possibility that the gene(s) may actually be involved in the process of X inactivation. This is the least likely mechanism, but it does not seem to warrant exclusion from discussion.

The timing of transcription of the gene products in Xq28 undoubtedly affects when the miscarriage occurs. In fact, the issue of timing is central to the inferred ge-