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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSTS</td>
<td>Bone and soft tissue sarcoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTD</td>
<td>Carboxy-terminal domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBD</td>
<td>DNA-binding domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR</td>
<td>Dual-luciferase assay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFT</td>
<td>Ewing sarcoma family tumor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>Fluorescence in situ hybridization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLuc</td>
<td>Firefly (<em>Photinus pyralis</em>) luciferase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>Immunohistochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGFMS</td>
<td>Low-grade fibromyxoid sarcoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEC</td>
<td>Mucoepidermoid carcinoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTD</td>
<td>Amino-terminal domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>Polymerase chain reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBD</td>
<td>RNA-binding domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLuc</td>
<td><em>Renilla reniformis</em> luciferase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-PCR</td>
<td>Reverse transcriptase-PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAD</td>
<td>Transcriptional activation domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Transcription factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFBS</td>
<td>Transcription factor binding site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt</td>
<td>Wild-type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREFACE

Translocations involving *EWSR1* and *FUS* typically characterize types of malignant bone and soft tissue tumors (sarcomas) that display few other aberrations. The translocation event and associated gene fusion are believed to be crucial for tumorigenesis and thus, these sarcomas provide excellent backgrounds for studying fusion-gene mediated tumorigenic mechanisms. The first sarcoma-associated fusion gene, *EWSR1-FLI1*, was identified almost 20 years ago and since then, several putative tumorigenic functions of EWSR1 and FUS chimeras have been unravelled. However, the fact that the cell-of-origin of most sarcomas is unknown poses a major problem for studying sacomagenesis. This is apparent because the tumorigenic properties of fusion proteins have been found to be dependent on specific cellular environments. Moreover, the genetic backgrounds of many sarcomas, as well as the tumorigenic roles of their associated chimeras, are still to a large extent unknown.

The general aim of this thesis has been to understand more about the role of EWSR1 and FUS chimeras in tumorigenesis. The thesis is divided in three sections; the first provides an introduction to the wild-type and tumorigenic functions of the EWSR1 and FUS proteins, the second contains a summary, including aims, materials and methods and conclusions, of the present work and the third includes the articles on which the thesis is based.

*Lund, April 2010*
INTRODUCTION

The acquired genetic events that underlie the tumorigenic process can be summarized to involve the activation of oncogenes or inactivation of tumor suppressor genes (Vogelstein and Kinzler, 2004). Oncogenic activation sometimes occurs through balanced chromosomal translocations of which numerous have been reported since the identification of the Philadelphia chromosome in chronic myeloid leukemia (Rowley, 1973). Many of these aberrations are of considerable diagnostic and prognostic importance, particularly for hematological malignancies and childhood sarcomas, and are believed to constitute early and important events in tumorigenesis (Mitelman et al, 2007).

Balanced translocations result either in the deregulation of a gene at one of the breakpoints, or the fusion of two genes, one from each breakpoint. *EWSR1* and *FUS* (alias *TLS*) were first identified as the targets of translocations t(11;22)(q24;q12) in the Ewing sarcoma family tumor (ESFT) and t(12;16)(q13;p11) in myxoid liposarcoma, respectively (Delattre et al, 1992, Crozat et al, 1993, Rabbitts et al, 1993). These translocations result in the formation of fusion oncogenes where the 5´-part of *EWSR1* or *FUS* is joined in-frame to the 3´-partner gene, in this case *FLI1* or *DDIT3* (alias *CHOP*) (Figure 1A). Subsequently, various analogous chimeric genes involving *EWSR1, FUS* or the related gene *TAF15* (alias *hTAF168* or *RBP56*), have been identified in bone and soft tissue tumors and leukemias.
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Figure 1. A) Translocation t(11;22)(q24;q12) in ESFT. The breakpoints on chromosomes 11 and 22 are marked with arrowheads. The fusion gene EWSR1-FLI1 is expressed from the EWSR1 promoter (arrow) on the derivative chromosome 22 (der(22)). B) Structure of the wild-type TET proteins. Arrowheads show the approximate locations of the most common breakpoints. In the chimeric proteins, the transcriptional activation domain (TAD) is retained while the RNA binding domain (RBD), zinc finger motif (Zn) and Arg-Gly-Gly (RGG) repeat rich regions are replaced with the DNA binding domains of the fusion partner. The number of amino acid residues is denoted below.

The TET proteins

The structurally and functionally related proteins EWSR1, FUS and TAF15 constitute the TET-family. Their structural features include a central RNA binding domain (RBD), Arg-Gly-Gly (RGG) repeat rich regions and a, possibly DNA-binding, Cys$_2$-Cys$_2$-type zinc finger motif in the carboxy-terminal domain (CTD). EWSR1, FUS and TAF15 also have in common a Ser-Tyr-Gly-Gln (SYGQ) rich amino-terminal domain (NTD) which functions as a transcriptional activation domain (TAD) (Delattre et al, 1992, Crozat et al, 1993, May et al, 1993, Prasad et al, 1994, Sánchez-García and Rabbitts, 1994, Bertolotti et al, 1996, Bertolotti et al, 1999). Typically, the TET
fusion genes encode chimeric transcription factors (TFs) in which the TAD is retained, while the RBD and RGG portions are replaced with the DNA-binding domain (DBD) of the fusion partner TF (Fig. 1B). Removal of the EWSR1 RBD and RGG boxes, which can repress transactivation, renders the TAD more potent in the chimeric protein (Bailly et al., 1994, Li and Lee, 2000).

The TET proteins are involved in transcription through their interaction with co-factors or DNA-binding proteins. Their direct interactions with distinct subpopulations of TFIID and subunits of RNA polymerase II link them to transcription initiation (Bertolotti et al., 1996, Bertolotti et al., 1998). EWSR1 functions as a transcriptional activator that associates with the co-activators p300 or CREB-binding protein (CBP) and is involved in POU5F1 (alias OCT-3/4)-, BRNA3A- and HNF4-mediated transcription (Rossow and Janknecht, 2001, Thomas and Latchman, 2002, Araya et al., 2003, Lee et al., 2005). FUS is involved in NFκB-mediated transcription and associates with the DBD of hormone receptors (Powers et al., 1998, Uranishi et al., 2001). TET proteins have also been linked to RNA splicing through their interaction with splicing factors, their presence in the spliceosome and involvement in splice site selection, possibly connecting the processes of transcription and splicing (Tan and Manley, 2009).

Mice with homozygous loss of EWSR1 and FUS displayed postnatal mortality, male and/or female sterility and defective B-cell development and/or activation (Hicks et al., 2000, Kuroda et al., 2000, Li et al., 2007). The phenotypes were similar but gene-specific, and loss of EWSR1 did not cause compensatory expression of FUS (Li et al., 2007). The mice also showed defective meiotic and homologous recombination processes and increased sensitivity to ionizing radiation, linking these proteins to DNA pairing and repair mechanisms. Moreover, FUS has been suggested to bind ssDNA and
mediate displacement-loop (D-loop) formation during DNA recombination and EWSR1 and FUS were found to be phosphorylated by DNA damage response proteins upon induction of DNA double strand breaks (Baechtold et al., 1999, Gardiner et al., 2008, Klevernic et al., 2009). Studies of the zebrafish (Danio rerio) EWSR1 orthologs suggest a role for EWSR1 also in maintaining mitotic integrity, as depletion of the proteins caused defective mitotic spindles and apoptosis (Azuma et al., 2007).

FUS has been found to be mutated in the neurodegenerative disease amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (Kwiatkowski et al., 2009, Vance et al., 2009). Through missense mutations, Arg residues in the CTD are replaced with other amino acids, often Cys, which leads to the mislocalization of FUS to the cytoplasm in the affected motor neurons. FUS has been found to bind RNA, presumably mRNA or pre-mRNA, both in the nucleus and cytoplasm and to be part of a kinesin-associated protein complex which can transport mRNA along neuronal microtubuli (Zinszner et al., 1997, Kanai et al., 2004). The mislocalization may impact mRNA transport and ultimately protein synthesis in the affected cells.

TET proteins can be post-transcriptionally regulated through Arg residue methylation, Ser/Thr phosphorylation or glycosylation, likely to affect their function, stability and localization (Tan and Manley 2009). However, very little is known about their transcriptional regulation, although it also directs the expression of the TET fusion genes. In Article I, we therefore characterized the activity of the EWSR1 promoter region in relation to conservation patterns and localization of TF binding sites (TFBSs).
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Rearrangement of TET genes in sarcomas

*EWSR1*, *FUS* and *TAF15* are involved in translocations that typically characterize different types of bone and soft tissue sarcomas (BSTSs) (Fig. 2). BSTSs are rare connective tissue malignancies that are heterogeneous in respect to their appearance, epidemiology, genetic alterations and progression (Fletcher *et al*, 2002, Osuna and de Álava, 2009). With few exceptions, the cell of origin and etiology of the tumor are unknown. As the diagnostic entities overlap morphologically, the distinction between them, or even between BSTSs and benign or non-neoplastic lesions, may be difficult. The identification of recurrent, tumor-type specific translocations in BSTSs with relatively simple karyotypes has aided the diagnosis and choice of treatment of these tumors and contributed to the unraveling of their pathogenesis (Osuna and de Álava, 2009). The classification of BSTSs is currently based on tumor morphology and molecular genetics, using a combination of techniques such as immunohistochemistry (IHC), cytogenetics and fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH), and polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based methods (Fletcher *et al*, 2002). Also, genome-wide analyses such as global gene expression arrays are increasingly used as classification tools and to identify markers of prognostic importance (Tschoep *et al*, 2007).

Of the TET members, *EWSR1* is most often rearranged as it has almost 20 identified partners, most of which are associated with BSTSs (Fig. 2) (Mitelman *et al*, 2010). Some of the TET fusion genes are remarkably specific for, and common in, certain tumor types, e. g. *EWSR1-FLI1* and *FUS-CREB3L2* in ESFT and low-grade fibromyxoid sarcoma (LGFMS), respectively (Turc-Carel *et al*, 1988, Panagopoulos *et al*, 2004). Other tumor types are characterized by TET fusion genes with alternating TET 5´-partners, e. g. *EWSR1-DDIT3* and *FUS-DDIT3* in myxoid liposarcoma, or *EWSR1*-
**Figure 2.** Summary of the known TET fusion genes (Mitelman *et al.*, 2010). Horizontal lines connect the TET 5'-partner gene (*EWSR1, FUS, TAF15*) with their 3'-partners (in the middle), and the tumor type(s) which they characterize (to the right). AML = Acute myeloid leukemia, ALL = Acute lymphoblastic leukemia, DSRCT = Desmoplastic small round cell tumor, AFH = Angiomatoid fibrous histiocyteoma, CCS = Clear cell sarcoma, EMCS = Extraskeletal myxoid chondrosarcoma. The TET fusions are most common in BSTSs and *EWSR1* is, among the TET genes, most often found in fusions.

*NR4A3* and *TAF15-NR4A3* in extraskeletal myxoid chondrosarcoma (EMCS), reflecting the analogous functions of the TET proteins (Fig. 2). The observed tumor-type specificity suggests that the fusion protein is dependent
on a certain cell type to initiate tumorigenesis. However, the same fusion gene may be present in vastly different tumor types; the \textit{EWSR1-POU5F1} fusion was found in an undifferentiated bone tumor (Yamaguchi \textit{et al}, 2005) as well as in skin hidradenomas and salivary gland carcinomas (Article II). \textit{FUS-ERG} was first identified in acute myeloid leukemias and subsequently in ESFT (Ichikawa \textit{et al}, 1994, Panagopoulos \textit{et al}, 1994, Shing \textit{et al}, 2003), and it has been suggested that this chimera exerts different effects in fibroblasts and hematopoietic cells (Zou \textit{et al}, 2005). It is possible that the chimeric protein is capable of initiating different tumorigenic programs depending on the cell type, giving rise to the specific tumor phenotype.

**Tumorigenic mechanisms of TET chimeras**

In translocation-positive cells, one wild-type (wt) allele of each fusion partner is lost and theoretically, two fusion genes (e. g. \textit{EWSR1-FLI1} and \textit{FLI1-EWSR1}) are created, both of which could contribute to tumorigenesis. Mice heterozygous for the \textit{EWSR1} or \textit{FUS} knock-out allele were indistinguishable from their litter mates (Hicks \textit{et al}, 2000, Kuroda \textit{et al}, 2000, Li \textit{et al}, 2007), suggesting that the wt functions of EWSR1 and FUS are retained in the tumor cells. However, it was recently described that EWSR1-FLI1 can directly interfere with wt EWSR1 function and thereby cause mitotic defects, which may contribute to tumorigenesis through increased genomic instability (Embree \textit{et al}, 2009). The reciprocal fusion gene (e. g. \textit{FLI1-EWSR1}) is considered to be dispensable for tumor growth since it is typically not expressed or does not result in the production of a full length chimeric protein (Delattre \textit{et al}, 1992, Panagopoulos \textit{et al}, 2002, Panagopoulos \textit{et al}, 2004). Hence, gained expression of the TET chimeric protein is believed to be crucial for tumorigenesis.
Ectopically expressed EWSR1 and FUS chimeras are able to transform cells and/or cause tumor formation in mice, and tumorigenicity is reduced when the fusion gene expression is abolished with siRNA (Herrero-Martín et al., 2009). Also, the tumor-type specificity of the fusion genes is reflected in the tumorigenic properties of the fusion proteins. The EWSR1 and FUS NTDs can substitute for each other in tumorigenic chimeric proteins, while the tumor phenotype depends on which partner, DDIT3 or FLI1, domain the chimera contains (Zinszner et al., 1994). Transgenic mice expressing FUS-DDIT3 in all tissues only develop adipocytic tumors resembling human liposarcomas, while mice expressing the DDIT3 or FUS domain alone are normal (Pérez-Losada et al., 2000a, Pérez-Losada et al., 2000b, Pérez-Mancera et al., 2002). Human fibrosarcoma cells expressing FUS-DDIT3 or full length DDIT3 induce liposarcomas in mice, whereas cells expressing the FUS NTD induce poorly differentiated sarcomas (Engström et al., 2006).

*EWSR1-FLI1* and *EWSR1-ERG* induce a common ESFT-like (based on morphology, IHC and gene expression) transformation of human mesenchymal progenitor cells (MPCs) (Miyagawa et al., 2008, Riggi et al., 2008). However, these cells are not tumorigenic in mice, while *EWSR1-FLI1* transformed murine MPCs are (Riggi et al., 2005). Moreover, *FUS-DDIT3*, but not *EWSR1-ATF1*, expression cause murine MPCs to be tumorigenic in mice (Riggi et al., 2006). These findings suggest that MPCs may not be the appropriate recipient cell type for some fusion genes, or that the fusion gene is not sufficient for tumorigenesis. Secondary events are observed in BSTSs with TET fusion genes. The majority of ESFT cases carries additional recurrent genomic imbalances, including gains of the *EWSR1* and *FLI1* loci (Savola et al., 2009). However, few tumor types have been subjected to detailed genomic characterization. We therefore analyzed LGFMS tumors with SNP array...
(Article IV) to investigate the presence of consistent genomic imbalances in this tumor type.

The TET chimeric proteins are believed to function as aberrant TFs that directly or indirectly cause anomalous expression of target genes. Through binding DNA directly, chimeras have been found to target several genes that are important for cell differentiation, survival or growth (Riggi et al, 2007, Kovar, 2010). Chimeras are generally thought of as transcriptional activators that may induce target gene expression by means of the potent TET TAD. EWSR1-FLI1, for example, is a stronger activator than the wt proteins through ETS sites, i.e. sequence motifs that are recognized by FLI1 and other members of the ETS family, which are also enriched in EWSR1-FLI1 immunoprecipitates (Bailly et al, 1994, Guillon et al, 2009). However, it has been suggested that EWSR1-FLI1 and EWSR1-ATF1 may also act as transcriptional repressors of some genes (Brown et al, 1995, Jishage et al, 2003, Kauer et al, 2009). Since chimeras can bind sequence motifs that are normally recognized by the wt partner TF, the target genes of the chimera can be expected to overlap with those of the fusion partner. Even so, the chimera may expand the target gene spectrum through the inappropriate expression of the fusion partner DBD, which can be achieved in different ways. For instance, since FLI1 expression is very restricted, the FLI1 domains become abnormally expressed through the fusion which is expressed from the ubiquitously active EWSR1 promoter (Mhawech-Fauceglia et al, 2007, Andersson et al, 2008). FUS-DDIT3 is localized to the nucleus, whereas DDIT3 is expressed at low levels and localized to the cytosol under normal conditions. DDIT3 localizes to the nucleus only upon endoplasmatic reticulum (ER) stress caused by the accumulation of unfolded proteins in the ER (Oyadomari et al, 2004). Hence, FUS-DDIT3 expression brings the
DDIT3 domains to an abnormal nuclear localization. ATF1 activity is regulated by cyclic AMP (cAMP) through a phosphorylation site in the NTD which is not retained in EWSR1-ATF1, and the chimera is therefore rendered constitutively active (Fujimura et al, 1996).

The TET chimeras are also involved in transcription through protein interactions, just like the wt proteins. The association of the EWSR1 or FUS NTD with RNA polymerase II is maintained in the chimeras, while the interaction with splicing factors, which normally occurs through the CTD, is lost, inhibited or altered (Yang et al, 2000a, Yang et al, 2000b, Chansky et al, 2001). Also, EWSR1-FLI1 has been suggested to affect CCND1 transcription in ESFT through lowering the RNA polymerase II elongation rate, resulting in the utilization of an upstream polyadenylation site and subsequent production of a more growth promoting CCND1 isoform (Sanchez et al, 2008). EWS-ETS chimeras have been found to bind some promoters in a ternary complex with AP-1 (FOS/JUN) (Kim et al, 2006), and EWSR1-FLI1 and EWSR1-ATF1 interact with CBP, potentially affecting the downstream apoptotic pathways (Fujimura et al, 2001, Ramakrishnan et al, 2004). Moreover, binding sites for other TFs have been found to coincide with ETS sites in EWSR1-FLI1 regulated genes, indicating that EWSR1-FLI1 may need to cooperate with these factors in target gene regulation (Kauer et al, 2009). FUS-DDIT3 interacts with NFKBIZ which affects NFκB-mediated transcription, interferes with a natural dimerization partner of DDIT3 and dysregulates key genes to block adipocytic differentiation (Peéez-Mancera et al, 2008, Göransson et al, 2009).

Nontheless, the knowledge about the tumorigenic mechanisms of many chimeras, e. g. FUS-CREB3L2, is still very limited. In Articles III and IV, we therefore studied the functions and DNA-binding preferences of the
wt CREB3L2 TF and the FUS-CREB3L2 chimera, and identified FUS-CREB3L2-dependent global gene expression patterns in LGFMS tumors.
THE PRESENT STUDY

AIMS

- To characterize the 5’-flanking regulatory region of *EWSR1* and delineate regions that are important for transcriptional activity in ESFT cell lines (Article I)

- To investigate the involvement of *EWSR1* rearrangements and *EWSR1-POU5F1* fusion in skin hidradenomas and salivary gland mucoepidermoid carcinomas (MECs) (Article II)

- To characterize the properties of the FUS-CREB3L2 chimera and the wt CREB3L2 transcription factor (Article III)

- To identify specific expression patterns that are associated with the presence of translocation t(7;16) and FUS-CREB3L2 chimera in LGFMS (Article IV)
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients and tumor samples

The majority of the tumor samples was obtained from patients treated at the orthopedic tumor centers at the Lund University Hospital or at the Karolinska Hospital in Stockholm. The samples were archived at the Department of Clinical Genetics, Lund. Paraffin-embedded tumor material was histopathologically reviewed and tumor cells were short-term cultured and subjected to cytogenetic characterization with chromosome banding analysis and FISH. When applicable, RNA and/or DNA was extracted from frozen specimens using standard molecular techniques for reverse transcriptase PCR (RT-PCR), real-time PCR, gene expression array or single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) array.

In addition to the samples from Swedish patients, ESFT tumor biopsies were obtained from patients treated at the Medical University of Gdansk, Poland (Article I). The majority of ESFT cases carries the translocation t(11;22)(q24;q12) and expresses the EWSR1-FLI1 fusion transcript. RT-PCR was used to confirm EWSR1-FLI1 expression in the present cases. For Article II, we had access to RNA or cDNA samples from additional hidradenomas and MECs for RT-PCR analysis and interphase FISH. These samples were obtained from the Department of Pathology at the Sahlgrenska University Hospital in Gothenburg or from the Department of Pathology at the University Hospital in Leuven, Belgium. For Article IV, material from 24 LGFMS cases was available from Sweden and seven other tumor centers in Europe and the U. S. A. (listed in Mertens et al, 2005), and used for gene expression array (19 cases), IHC analyses (nine cases) and/or SNP array analysis (nine cases). All cases but one harbored the LGFMS-specific translocation t(7;16)(q33;p11) and/or expressed the FUS-CREB3L2
fusion transcript. The remaining case harbored the rare variant translocation t(11;16)(p11;p11) and expressed FUS-CREB3L1. A few cases lacked the t(7;16) at cytogenetic analysis and instead had one or more supernumerary ring chromosomes. Myxofibrosarcoma (MFS), desmoid fibromatosis (DFM), solitary fibrous tumor (SFT) and EMCS tumors, which share histological features with LGFMS (Billings et al., 2005, Guillou et al., 2007, Weiss and Goldblum, 2008, Meng et al., 2009), were included as comparison to the LGFMS group in the gene and protein expression analyses. All but one of these samples were obtained from patients treated at the orthopedic tumor centers in Lund or Stockholm. One EMCS sample was obtained from the Department of Cancer Genetics at the Norwegian Radium Hospital in Oslo. All EMCS were characterized by the translocations t(9;22)(q22;q12) or t(9;17)(q22;q11) and showed expression of the EWSR1-NR4A3 or TAF15-NR4A3 fusion transcripts. The MFS cases were of the low-grade variant with 37-58 chromosomes (Mentzel et al., 1996). For Article IV, we also constructed a tissue microarray (TMA) with material from LGFMS, MFS, DFM, SFT and EMCS tumors to facilitate the IHC analyses. For the TMA construction, tissue columns were cut from histologically representative areas of the paraffin-embedded material and inserted into recipient TMA paraffin blocks with 50 cases on each block.

All samples were obtained after informed consent and the studies were approved by the local ethics committees.

Cell lines

Established cell lines are preferred for in vitro studies since they are usually easily cultured and transfected, and generally generate reproducible results. For Article I, several ESFT cell lines were available. These cell lines
The present study may carry additional and different aberrations compared to ESFT tumors, but at least have the expression of *EWSR1-FLI1* in common which is specific and important for ESFT tumorigenesis. However, for many BSTSs, established cell lines are not readily available and human embryonic kidney (HEK293) or murine embryonic fibroblast (NIH3T3) cells that grow rapidly and are easily manipulated were chosen in these instances.

For Article I, the established ESFT cell lines A-673, RD-ES, SK-ES-1, SK-NEP-1 and SK-PN-DW were purchased from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) and MHH-ES-1, RH-1, SK-N-MC and TC-71 from Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen (DSMZ). The cell line TTC-466 was donated by Dr P. H. Sorensen at the Department of Pathology, Children’s and Women’s Hospital of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. The HEK293 and NIH3T3 cell lines, purchased from the Interlab Cell Line Collection (ICLC), were used for Articles I-IV. All cells were cultured according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. When required, RNA and/or protein was extracted from cultured cells using standard molecular techniques and used for RT-PCR, real-time PCR, gene expression array or western blot, respectively. The cells were transfected with various reporter gene constructs and/or expression plasmids to investigate promoter activity (Article I), transcriptional activation potential and activation of transcription through specific regulatory sequences (Articles II-IV) and subcellular localization of proteins (Article III), as discussed below. HEK293 cells were also transfected with FUS-CREB3L2-pCMV-Tag2B (Stratagene, La Jolla, CA, USA) constructs (Article IV) which allows for G418 (geneticin) selection of stable transfectants. In this construct, the *FUS-CREB3L2* cDNA is cloned adjacent to the FLAG epitope, downstream of the CMV promoter (cytomegalovirus immediate early promoter). Nuclear expression of NTD
The present study

FLAG-tagged FUS-CREB3L2 was detected with western blot and immunocytochemistry using an anti-FLAG M2 antibody (Stratagene). Cells were transfected using Effectene, Polyfect (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) or FuGENE (Roche Applied Science, Indianapolis, IN, USA) according to the manufacturers’ recommendations.

**In silico analyses of regulatory sequences**

The basal (or core) promoter regions, where the general transcriptional machinery assembles, are perhaps the most straightforward to study among the regulatory sequences due to their location directly upstream of transcription start sites (TSS). The basal transcription is modulated by TFs that bind sites in the proximal promoter region, which extends a few hundred bp upstream of the core promoter. Eukaryotic promoters are diverse and it is now understood that only a minority has the characteristic TATA(T/A)/(T/A) and/or CCAAT sequences in the basal and proximal promoters, respectively. Instead, the presence of CpG islands was found to correlate the best with promoter activity (Cooper *et al*, 2006). The distal promoter region contains TFBSs that further tune the expression of the downstream gene, perhaps in a cell-type specific or temporal manner (Farnham, 2009). Distal regions may extend downstream of the TSS to involve intronic regions and the regulatory elements of a gene can be located far away, even on a different chromosome (Miele and Dekker, 2008). Moreover, alternating and bi-directional promoters can regulate the same gene and are abundant in the genome (Trinklein *et al*, 2004, Kimura *et al*, 2006). These aspects make the definition of promoter outer boundaries arbitrary and the selection of putatively biologically important TFBSs challenging. Utilizing a combination of different programs that predict the localization of TSSs,
The present study

promoter sequences, TFBSs, CpG islands and conserved regions may aid this decision. Naturally, coupling the *in silico* analysis with *in vitro* experiments is necessary for evaluating biological relevance.

Most of the TFBS prediction programs, e.g. MatInspector (Quandt *et al*, 1995), utilize the TRANSFAC or JASPAR databases in which TFBSs are described as positional weight matrices (PWMs). A PWM is generated through aligning a set of TFBS sequences, identified from *in vitro* studies, and calculating the frequency of each base at each sequence position to create a nucleotide distribution matrix. Each nucleotide is then given a value (weight) depending on the conservation of the individual nucleotide position in the matrix; the maximum value 100 for total conservation and the minimum value zero for equal distribution of the four bases. The consecutive nucleotides with the highest weights constitute the TFBS core sequence (Quandt *et al*, 1995). MatInspector and Match (Kel *et al*, 2003) utilize PWMs to search an unknown sequence for matches to the consensus matrix descriptions and core sequences. In the simplest case, TFBSs can be identified by sequence comparison to the consensus sequence utilizing the program Patch (Wingender, 2008).

For the study of the *EWSR1* promoter region (Article I), the sequence which extends from 1600 bp upstream (-1600) to 400 bp downstream (+400) of the TSS that covers the most conserved regions, was characterized. The TFBS prediction programs MatInspector, Match and Patch, the CpG rich region identification tool CpGPlot (Larsen *et al*, 1992), the comparative genomics tool GenomeVISTA (Couronne *et al*, 2003) and multiple alignment tool MultiAlin (Corpet, 1988) were used for the *in silico* analyses of the sequence. MultiAlin was also used for the alignment of the amino acid sequences of the CREB3 family basic and leucine zipper regions.
The present study (Article III). In Article IV, the pattern of TFBSs in the promoters of the genes that were specifically expressed in LGFMS tumors and FUS-CREB3L2 expressing cells was analyzed with the program SMART (systematic motif analysis retrieval tool) (Veerla et al, 2010). RefSeq mRNA and UCSC promoter sequence information and TRANSFAC v 2009.1 PWMs were utilized to identify TFBSs in the -1500 to +500 sequence of each gene’s TSS, as well as in the conserved (between human and mouse) regions within the -5000 +1000 sequence. TFBSs with a significant enrichment ($P_E$) and presence ($P_P$) in the gene list were identified. The $P_E$ value is the probability of finding the observed number of instances of a given TFBS, and $P_P$ the probability of finding the observed number of promoters with at least one instance of a given TFBS, in randomly generated gene lists. SMART was also used to cluster genes that display a similar TFBS pattern in their promoters (promoter clustering). Moreover, the regulatory sequences of CD24 and FOXL1 were investigated in silico using MatInspector, Patch, CpGPlot, GenomeVISTA and Promoterscan (Prestridge, 1995) (Article IV). Promoterscan identifies regions which contain TFBSs that are more frequent in eukaryotic RNA polymerase II promoters than in non-promoter sequences (Prestridge, 1995).

**Studying transcriptional activity *in vitro***

The utilization of reporter genes has greatly facilitated the investigation of gene expression and protein interactions in living cells and organisms. The green fluorescent protein (GFP) and firefly luciferase (FLuc), derived from the jellyfish *Aequorea victoria* and firefly *Photinus pyralis*, respectively, have been widely used for these purposes. Enhanced GFP (EGFP) exhibits green fluorescence when exposed to blue light and was utilized to monitor the subcellular localization of the full length and truncated...
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CREB3L2 and FUS-CREB3L2 proteins in Article III. Throughout the study (Articles I-IV), FLuc was utilized to measure transcriptional activity using the dual luciferase reporter (DLR) assay system (Promega, Madison, WI, USA), where the Fluc enzymatic activity is measured as light emission upon addition of the FLuc substrate to the sample (cell lysate). The subsequently added *Renilla reniformis* luciferase (RLuc) substrate simultaneously quenches the FLuc reaction and initiates the RLuc reaction, and light of a different wavelength is emitted. Typically, the expression of FLuc, and thus also the FLuc activity, is influenced by the experimental conditions whereas the RLuc expression (and activity) serves as the internal control. The FLuc luminescence is normalized to that of RLuc, expressing the results as ratios; FLuc:RLuc.

**Promoter activity**

The two kbp *EWSR1* upstream sequence was characterized in vector pFLhRL where the luciferase genes are transcribed in opposite directions with RLuc under the control of the SV40 promoter (simian virus 40 early enhancer/promoter) (Fig. 3A, top) (Möller *et al.*, 2007). Thereby, the use of two individual Luc reporter gene plasmids, which may influence the transcription of each other (Huszár *et al.*, 2001), is avoided. Nine deletion constructs were generated that contained specific but overlapping portions of the *EWSR1* promoter region, cloned upstream of FLuc. In this way, functional regions of the sequence can be identified that are important for promoter function or are likely to recruit negatively or positively acting factors. In addition, different portions of the sequence surrounding the TSSs of *EWSR1* and the nearby gene *RHBDD3* were cloned in the opposite direction in order to estimate their bidirectional activity.
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Figure 3. A) In pFLhRL, a promoter region can be cloned upstream (arrowhead) of FLuc (yellow), while RLuc (red) is constitutively expressed from the SV40 promoter in the same vector. In pBIND, the cDNA encoding a presumed transcriptional activator (arrowhead) is cloned in-frame to the GAL4 DBD cDNA, downstream of the CMV promoter. The GAL4 fusion protein binds the GAL4 binding sites (BS) upstream of the basal promoter (small grey box), of the pG5 vector and may stimulate the assembly of the preinitiation complex (PIC) to enhance the expression of FLuc. Small white boxes = SV40 polyadenylation signals. B) In Article II, EWSR1-POU5F1 was found to be a stronger transcriptional activator than the two wt POU5F1 isoforms (top) using the pBIND system. Also, EWSR1-POU5F1 activated transcription through the POU5F1 binding sites of the NANOG promoter (middle) and POU5F1 distal enhancer (bottom), compared to the regulatory sequence itself (“empty”). However, POU5F1 wt1 was the strongest activator through these sites. The POU5F1 enhancer was cloned upstream of the SV40 promoter, grey bars represent the activity of the SV40 promoter alone. X axes show the relative luminescence (FLuc:RLuc ratios).

Transcriptional activation potential

To investigate if EWSR1-POU5F1 and wt POU5F1 (Article II), wt CREB3L2 and FUS-CREB3L2 (Article III), can function as transcriptional activators, their respective cDNAs were cloned in-frame to the GAL4 DBD
encoding sequence of the pBIND vector (Promega) (Fig. 3A, middle). The GAL4-fusion transcript is constitutively expressed from the CMV promoter. The pBIND constructs were co-transfected with the pG5\textit{luc} vector (Promega) which contains GAL4 DBD binding sites upstream of a minimal basal promoter that drives the expression of \textit{FLuc} (Fig. 3A, middle). A transcriptional activator will stimulate the assembly and stabilization of the preinitiation complex (PIC) and basal transcription machinery and thereby increase the expression of \textit{FLuc}, as compared to the GAL4 DBD alone (Fig. 3A, bottom, and 3B).

\textit{Activation of transcription through regulatory sequences}

The DNA-binding preferences of the EWSR1-POU5F1, wt POU5F1, FUS-CREB3L2 and wt CREB3L2 proteins were investigated in Articles II and III-IV, respectively. Upon removal of the GAL4 DBD, the pBIND constructs mentioned above (constitutively expressing each of the proteins) were co-transfected with plasmids containing specific TFBSs, enhancer elements or promoter regions of putative target genes cloned upstream of \textit{Fluc}. In Article IV, the regulatory sequences of \textit{CD24} or \textit{FOXL1} were cloned in pFLhRL and co-transfected with pCR3.1-based FUS-CREB3L2 expression plasmids (without reporter gene). Regardless of the vector system used, the regulatory sequence may activate the \textit{FLuc} expression on its own. However, if the transcriptional activator acts directly or indirectly through the cloned site to stimulate transcription, the expression of \textit{FLuc} markedly increases (Fig. 3B, middle and bottom).
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Determining gene expression patterns and levels

Tumor RNA was reverse transcribed into cDNA and used as template in RT-PCR for the detection of fusion transcripts (Articles I and II) and in quantitative real-time PCR for the estimation of gene expression (Articles I and IV). Northern blot, in which the RNA is size separated through gel electrophoresis and hybridized to a specific probe, was used in Article III to analyze CREB3L2 expression in human tissues. This way, the complete transcript length can be determined. For the global detection of gene expression in Article IV, tumor cDNA was labeled and hybridized onto the Human GeneChip® Gene 1.0 ST array which detects whole transcripts with 764,885 distinct probe sets (Affymetrix, Santa Clara, CA, USA).

Gene expression levels of a sample are always formulated relative the expression levels of another sample. Ideally in gene expression analysis, a tumor sample is compared to the corresponding normal tissue from the same patient (paired samples). But even then, between samples variation may remain due to different routines in handling biopsies or extracting RNA, interfering with the downstream data analyses. The etiology, as well as the corresponding normal tissue, is unknown for many BSTSs and thus, proper paired samples are rarely available. In the real-time PCR analyses, the expression level of the gene-of-interest was compared to that of a housekeeping gene, giving a relative estimate of the gene expression levels (Articles I and IV). As the LGFMS cell of origin is uncertain, the LGFMS group was compared to tumor types with a similar morphology in the gene expression array analysis (Article IV). Previous studies have emphasized that the distinction of LGFMS from MFS and DFM may be difficult (Folpe et al, 2000, Billings et al, 2005, Guillou et al, 2007), thereby motivating the current comparison. Moreover, the program and approach chosen for data analysis,
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Figure 4. A) Analysis of gene expression data with PCA (3D) and HCL (2D). The tumor groups; LGFMS (blue), MFS (purple), DFM (red), EMCS (green) and SFT (yellow) were clearly different from each other and an outlier LGFMS sample (asterisk) was identified (Article IV). B) Identification of recurrent deletions (shaded areas) at and nearby the CREB3L2 breakpoints in LGFMS tumors, with SNP array (Article IV). The deletions are visible by deviating B allele frequency (BAF) and LogR ratio. The mean Log R ratio is marked with a red line.

which involves finding similarity patterns in the data and performing statistical tests, can influence the interpretation of the data. This potential problem may be circumvented by unsupervised examination of the data, i. e. allowing the data to organize themselves without presumptions, using different programs and methods, e. g. hierarchical clustering analysis (HCL) and principal component analysis (PCA). PCA with the program Qluore Omics Explorer v
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2.0 (Quacore AB, Lund, Sweden) allows for interactive imaging of multidimensional data (e.g., gene expression data) in a three-dimensional (3D) space, which facilitates the visualization of similarity patterns in the data set (Fig. 4A).

Detection of genomic imbalances

Genomic imbalances such as amplifications and deletions are present in many cancers and typically point out regions that contain oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes, respectively. As there are more than one million known SNPs distributed throughout the genome, they provide a high-resolution platform for the estimation of copy number. Since SNPs provide allele-specific information, copy number neutral loss-of-heterozygosity (LOH) events, e.g., uniparental disomy, or mono-allelic amplifications can also be detected.

In Article IV, we used SNP array analysis to identify genomic imbalances in LGFMS tumor samples (Fig. 4B). Tumor DNA was amplified, fragmented, hybridized and labeled on the Human Omni 1-Quad v 1.0 array (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) which assays more than 1 million selected SNPs. Access to a patient-matched normal DNA sample is helpful for the identification of normal copy number variations. However, such samples are not always available. In the normalization procedure, the tumor sample data are compared to those of 120 normal individuals, thereby aiding the identification of normal genomic variation.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Article I

Bidirectionality and transcriptional activity of the EWSR1 promoter region.

The TET proteins are ubiquitously expressed in human tissues, displaying both specific and overlapping expression patterns (Andersson et al, 2008). Investigation of the first 600 bp of the EWSR1 5´-regulatory region revealed that it lacked TATA and CAAT-boxes, was GC-rich and had several putative TSSs (Plougastel et al, 1993). However, the close head-to-head arrangement of EWSR1 and RHBDD3 was not recognized in that study. When analyzing two kbp of the EWSR1 regulatory sequence in the present study, a putative CpG-island was identified that covered the intergenic region and extended beyond the first exons of both genes. This, in addition to the short distance (100-400 bp depending on the definition of the EWSR1 TSS) between the EWSR1 and RHBDD3 TSSs, are recognized features of bidirectional promoters (Adachi and Lieber, 2002, Trinklein et al, 2004). Peaks in conservation were observed for the intergenic region and sequence directly upstream of the EWSR1 TSS. These regions are included in the -400 to +400 portion which was found to be important for promoter activity, also when cloned in the reverse orientation. Deleting part of the upstream sequence (-1600 to -440) had little effect on promoter activity. By real-time PCR, RHBDD3 was expressed in ESFT biopsies and cell lines and ubiquitously expressed across tissues, just like EWSR1.

When cloned in the reverse orientation, fragments including the 400 bp sequence downstream of the EWSR1 TSS had the highest activity. In contrast, deletion of the +65 to +400 portion was necessary to achieve high activity with fragments cloned in the forward orientation. The discrepancy between these observations could be explained by the involvement of
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orientation-dependent TFBSs in the regulation of one of the genes. Conserved SP binding sites and an E-box, which is recognized by MYC, MAX and USF factors, are present in this region and may be involved in the regulation of this sequence. The narrow region directly downstream of the \( EWSR1 \) TSS was most important for promoter activity and is likely to be required for basal transcription. A binding site for the ubiquitously expressed factor YY1 can be found in this region, perhaps suggesting its involvement in transcription initiation. However, in order to identify active sites that are crucial for promoter activity, TFBS mutation analyses would be required.

The presence of SP sites and E-box sequences, and lack of a TATA box, within a CpG island that covers the TSS, is more common in housekeeping gene promoters than in those with tissue-specific activity (Rozenberg et al, 2008, Zhu et al, 2008). Taken together, our results suggest that \( EWSR1 \) and \( RHBDD3 \) are regulated in a house-keeping manner through a common bi-directional promoter. Thus, it is likely that also the expression of \( EWSR1 \) fusion genes is regulated in the same way. Decreased \( RHBDD3 \) expression has been associated with cancer. In pituitary tumors, CpG-island methylation seems to be the causative mechanism behind the decreased expression, whereas in colorectal tumors the mechanism is unknown (Bahar et al, 2004, Bahar et al, 2007). As the \( EWSR1 \) promoter is predicted to regulate two genes with divergent involvement in several different tumor types, there is a need for understanding the regulatory networks acting through this sequence.
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Article II

POU5F1, encoding a key regulator of stem cell pluripotency, is fused to EWSR1 in hidradenoma of the skin and mucoepidermoid carcinoma of the salivary glands.

The index case was diagnosed as a hidradenoma based on the histopathological examination. The cytogenetic and molecular genetic analyses revealed the presence of a translocation t(6;22)(p21;q12) and expression of an EWSR1-POU5F1 fusion transcript as the sole aberration. We could also show that the tumor cells displayed strong nuclear, and weak cytoplasmic, expression of POU5F1 by IHC with an antibody against the POU5F1 CTD. Thereby, this was the first report of an EWSR1 fusion gene in epithelial tumors.

Hidradenoma, which primarily affects adults, is a benign, epidermal sweat gland neoplasm which contains different cell types of varying proportions (McNiff et al, 2006). The variant in which glycogen-containing clear cells predominate (clear cell hidradenoma) has been found to harbor the translocation t(11;19)(q21;p13) and CRTC1-MAML2 fusion, while fusion-negative tumors were mainly composed of poroid and cuticular cells (Winnes et al, 2007). When analyzing additional cases of CRTC1-MAML2-negative hidradenomas with no or few (≤ 10-15%) clear cells, we identified the EWSR1-POU5F1 fusion in two cases and EWSR1 split signals in two cases. MEC is another glandular tumor which primarily affects adults, contains different cell types at varying proportions and harbors the translocation t(11;19)(q21;p13) and the CTRC1-MAML2 fusion. Previous studies suggested that CTRC1-MAML2-positive MEC tumors occur in younger individuals and are highly differentiated, low-grade and smaller (Behboudi et al, 2006, Okabe et al, 2006). Another study identified the CTRC1-MAML2 fusion in tumors of
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all grades (Tirado et al, 2007) and recently, CDKN2A (p16) deletions were associated with unfavorable outcomes of CTRC1-MAML2-positive MEC tumors, suggesting that the fusion is an early event and that additional aberrations are needed to develop metastatic disease (Anzick et al, 2010). Due to the genetic and biological similarities between hidradenoma and MEC, we included poorly differentiated CTRC1-MAML2-negative MECs in the present study and found an EWSR1 split signal and EWSR1-POU5F1 fusion in one case. Our findings provide further evidence of a genetic link between hidradenoma and MEC, indicating that common molecular pathways may be involved in the development of these tumors.

In the fusion transcripts detected in the present study, a part of EWSR1 exon 6 was fused in-frame to a part of POU5F1 exon 2. Previously, an EWSR1-POU5F1 fusion was identified in one case of undifferentiated bone tumor where exon 6 of EWSR1 was fused to exon 1 of POU5F1 (Yamaguchi et al, 2005). Both fusion transcript variants are predicted to encode the NTD EWSR1 and the DBD of POU5F1, analogous to other EWSR1 chimeric proteins. As expected, we could show that the EWSR1-POU5F1 chimera is a stronger transcriptional activator than wt POU5F1 using the GAL4-based vector system (Fig. 3B). POU5F1 is one of the key regulators of embryonic stem cell pluripotency and is known to bind the pou5f1/sox2 composite element in the Pou5f1 distal enhancer and in the promoter of the target gene Nanog (Chew et al, 2005, Rodda et al, 2005). The EWSR1-POU5F1 chimera activated transcription more efficiently than the POU5F1 isoform 2 (wt2) through these sites, yet weaker than the longer wt POU5F1 isoform 1 (wt1) and wt EWSR1 (Fig. 3B). It cannot be excluded that the chimera might prefer other sequence motifs, or primarily act through indirect mechanisms. As EWSR1 lacks an obvious DBD, it seems likely that
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the activation through these elements by EWSR1 occurs through protein interactions. Interestingly, the NTD of EWSR1 has been found to associate with the POU5F1 central POU domain, which is retained in the chimera, and enhance POU5F1-mediated transcription (Lee et al., 2005).

The chimera identified in the present study (called EWS-OCT-4B) was recently found to be localized to the nucleus, to be a weaker transcriptional activator than the first identified EWSR1-POU5F1 chimera, to directly bind the POU5F1 octamer motif and to be tumorigenic in mice (Kim et al., 2010). Also, upregulation of the POU5F1 target genes FGF-4 and NANOG was observed in cells with stable expression of EWS-OCT-4B. However, the DNA-binding and regulatory actions of the chimera were not compared to those of the full length wt proteins, and it is not established whether the target gene activation is direct or indirect. The results from this study are therefore consistent with our results in that the chimera is capable of activating transcription through the octamer motif, although it may be a relatively weak transcriptional activator.

POU5F1 is expressed during embryogenesis and maintained only in the germ cell lineage of the adult. It has been proposed that POU5F1 is expressed in adult differentiated tissues and tumors, however not all reports securely distinguish POU5F1 from its transcribed pseudogenes, POU5F1 wt 1 from the putative pseudogene-encoded protein POU5F1P1, or between the POU5F1 isoforms (de Jong and Loijenga, 2006, Kotoula et al., 2008, Panagopoulos et al., 2008). The translocation t(6;22) may constitute a mechanism of POU5F1 reactivation, whereby the POU5F1 DBD becomes inappropriately expressed, causing the anomalous regulation of target genes and contributing to de-differentiation.
**Article III**

Characterization of the native CREB3L2 transcription factor and the FUS/CREB3L2 chimera.

CREB3L2 (alias BBF2H7) was first identified as part of the FUS-CREB3L2 fusion gene, the result of translocation t(7;16)(q32-34;p11), in LGFMS (Storlazzi et al., 2003). The t(7;16) or variant t(11;16)(p11;p11) and the corresponding chimeras FUS-CREB3L2 or -CREB3L1 (alias OASIS) were subsequently found to be specific for LGFMS (Panagopoulos et al., 2004). The knowledge about wt CREB3L2 is limited, but CREB3L1 is structurally and functionally related to CREB3L3 (CREB-H), CREB3L4 (CREB4), CREB3 (Luman) and ATF6. These proteins are ER resident through their transmembrane (TM) domains and are activated by regulated intramembrane proteolysis (RIP) in response to the accumulation of misfolded proteins in the ER (ER-stress) (Bailey and O’Hare, 2007). Upon ER-stress, the cleaved fragment which contains the basic and leucine zipper (bZIP) domains, is translocated to the nucleus where it can activate transcription of target genes, e.g. HSPA5 (GRP78). It has been suggested that the target gene activation acts to rescue the cell from ER-stress induced apoptosis (Kondo et al., 2005, Kondo et al., 2007).

In the present study, we showed that also CREB3L2 belongs to this protein family. By *in silico* analysis, the predicted bZIP and TM amino acid sequences of CREB3L2 are highly similar to those of CREB3L1/L3/L4, CREB3 and ATF6, with the highest similarity to CREB3L1. Like CREB3L1, CREB3L2 expression was detected in various normal tissues. Moreover, the *in vitro* subcellular localization experiments showed that CREB3L2 was localized to the ER, while the truncated protein CREB3L2ΔTM, which lacks the TM and luminal domains, was localized to the nucleus.
The present study corresponds to the cleaved fragment which would be produced by an activated RIP pathway. Analogous to CREB3L2, we found that FUS-CREB3L2 was cytosolic and FUS-CREB3L2ΔTM nuclear. This suggests that CREB3L2 and FUS-CREB3L2 may undergo RIP, just like CREB3L1.

By utilizing the GAL4 system, we found that CREB3L2 can function as a transcriptional activator and the TAD was mapped to the first 120 aa. This part is replaced with the more potent TAD of the FUS NTD in FUS-CREB3L2, and the chimera was found to be a stronger transcriptional activator than CREB3L2. The full length andΔTM CREB3L2 and FUS-CREB3L2, respectively, proteins were equally efficient as activators. We also investigated the transcriptional activity of CREB3L2 and FUS-CREB3L2 through the box-B element, cAMP responsive element (CRE), ATF6 binding sites and the HSPA5 (GRP78) promoter, which have been found to be activated by CREB3L1 and CREB3L1ΔTM (Omori et al, 2002, Kondo et al, 2005). CREB3L2 activated transcription through these sites and CREB3L2ΔTM was a stronger activator than the full length protein, analogous to CREB3LΔTM. FUS-CREB3L2 was the strongest activator through the cloned sites but, surprisingly, FUS-CREB3L2ΔTM was the weakest. Another study identified CREB3L2 to be an ER-stress induced TF and that CREB3L2ΔTM directly binds CRE sites in the HSPA5 promoter, which is in agreement with our results (Kondo et al, 2007).

The structural and functional similarities between CREB3L2 and CREB3L1 suggest that the FUS-CREB3L2/L1 chimeras might have analogous functions in LGFMS. The oncogenic role of these chimeras is unknown but can be hypothesized to entail anomalous regulation of genes normally controlled by CREB3L2/L1. Although FUS-CREB3L2ΔTM was not the strongest activator through the selected TFBSs, it was located in the
nucleus and was capable of activating transcription through CREB3L2/L1 response elements. As it has been suggested that the CREB3L2 protein is not expressed under normal conditions (Kondo et al., 2005, Kondo et al., 2007), the inappropriate expression of the CREB3L2 bZIP DBD through the chimera may be sufficient for anomalous target gene regulation, despite a relatively weak transactivation capability.

Article IV

Low-grade fibromyxoid sarcoma has a specific expression profile with upregulation of CD24 and FOXL1

LGFMS is a rare, indolent, soft tissue tumor which typically arises in the deep, intramuscular tissue of young adults. The tumor cells are bland, spindle-shaped, of fibroblastic or myofibroblastic differentiation and surrounded by a myxoid or collagenized matrix (Folpe et al., 2002). However, LGFMS may also display areas of hypercellularity, nuclear pleomorphism and capillary infiltration, and has a potential for local recurrence and metastasis. Consequently, LGFMS may be confused with more benign tumors such as DFM, or more aggressive tumors such as MFS (Mentzel et al., 1996, Billings et al., 2005, Weiss and Goldblum, 2008). In the present study, we compared the gene expression profile of LGFMS with that of MFS, DFM, SFT and EMCS, and could show that LGFMS is clearly distinct from the other entities (Fig. 4A). LGFMS was most similar to MFS and secondly to DFM on the gene expression level.

The detection of t(7;16) or t(11;16) and the FUS-CREB3L2/L1 fusion transcripts, are the most solid diagnostic criteria for LGFMS (Panagopoulos et al., 2004). A subset of LGFMS cases expresses FUS-CREB3L2 but lacks the t(7;16) and instead harbors one or more
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supernumerary ring chromosomes, and it has been shown that the fusion gene may reside in the ring (Bartuma et al, 2010). By SNP array analysis of LGFMS tumors, we found no other recurrent genomic aberrations other than translocation t(7;16)-associated deletions and gain of 7q in cases with ring chromosomes, emphasizing the importance of the fusion gene event in LGFMS (Fig. 4B). The detected deletions remove most of the FUS and CREB3L2 portions not involved in the fusion gene, thereby explaining the absence of reciprocal fusion gene expression (Panagopoulos et al, 2004). Gain of 7q in two cases, and of a small 16p11 segment in one case, with supernumerary ring chromosomes is in agreement with previous analyses of ring chromosomes in LGFMS (Mezzelani et al, 2000, Bartuma et al, 2010). Gain of 7q has been identified as a recurrent secondary event also in translocation t(12;16)-positive cases of myxoid liposarcoma (Mandahl et al, 1994).

The FUS-CREB3L2 chimera may cause the anomalous expression of CREB3L2 target genes. However, little is known about these target genes and the known CREB3L2/L1 target HSPA5 was not upregulated in the LGFMS tumors or in cells with stable expression of FUS-CREB3L2 (FC-HEK) of the present study. Since CREB3L2 and CREB3L2ΔTM were found to preferentially bind CRE sites (Kondo et al, 2007), we hypothesized that CREB3L2 and FUS-CREB3L2 regulate genes that contain CRE sites in their promoters. Indeed, many of the LGFMS upregulated genes contained CRE half-sites in their promoters, although these sites were not significantly overrepresented. Instead, we found significant enrichment (P_e) and presence (P_p) of binding sites for FOX factors. Of these, FOXL1 and FOXF1 are located close to each other on 16q24 and were specifically upregulated in LGFMS (Fig. 5A), indicating that FOX factors are important for LGFMS.
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*FOXL1* was the top upregulated gene in LGFMS but was not specifically upregulated in FC-HEK, suggesting that the regulation of this gene is not directly caused by FUS-CREB3L2. In support of this, FUS-CREB3L2ΔTM only had a small effect on the *FOXL1* promoter (which contains one CRE half-site) in luciferase assays (Fig. 5B, right). *Foxl1* and *Foxf1* are regulated by Gli1 and Gli2 in the Hedgehog (Hh) pathway in the mouse ([Madison *et al*, 2009]). Hh ligands and targets, e.g. *FOXL1*, *FOXF1*, *PTCH1*, *SHH*, *BCL2* and to some extent *GLI1* and *GLI2*, were expressed at higher levels in LGFMS, although not displaying LGFMS-specific expression, suggesting a role for this pathway in LGFMS.

The subset of genes that was specifically upregulated both in LGFMS and FC-HEK may contain putative FUS-CREB3L2 target genes. *CD24* was among those genes and we could show that FUS-CREB3L2ΔTM and CREB3L2ΔTM activated transcription from a *CD24* regulatory sequence which contains two CRE half-sites (Fig. 5B, left). *CD24* is a glycosylated cell surface mucin which is expressed in various carcinomas where cytoplasmic *CD24* expression, compared to membraneous, has been associated with poor prognosis and metastasis ([Kristiansen *et al*, 2004, Lee *et al*, 2009]). Additional experiments such as TFBS mutation analyses and/or ChIP-chip or gel-shift assay investigation would be needed to characterize the FUS-CREB3L2 interaction with *CD24*.

The expression of selected LGFMS-specific genes on the protein level (CASR, CD24, CREB3L2, FOXL1, MUC4, PRKCB1, PTN, SCUBE1 and TMPRSS2) is currently being examined. Proteins that show LGFMS-specific expression could potentially be used as LGFMS markers, but this would, however, need to be evaluated in larger series of LGFMS and differential diagnostic entities.
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Figure 5. A) FOXL1 was the top upregulated gene in LGFMS (blue), compared to the DFM (red), EMCS (green), MFS (purple) and SFT (yellow) groups. FOXL1, FOXF1 and FOXC2 are located at 16q24 and all upregulated in LGFMS. Binding sites for FOXL1 and FOXF1 were significantly enriched in the promoters of LGFMS upregulated genes. MTHFSD is transcribed in the opposite direction and was not specifically upregulated in LGFMS. B) CD24 was specifically upregulated in FUS-CREB3L2 expressing cells (dark red), compared to cells transfected with empty vector (dark grey) and control cells (green). The regulatory sequences of CD24 (middle) and FOXL1 (right), which contain CRE half-sites, were cloned in pFLhRL and transfected together with 100 ng or 1 µg of FUS-CREB3L2ΔTM (F-C)- or CREB3L2ΔTM (C)-expression plasmids, or empty vector (pCR3.1). FUS-CREB3L2ΔTM activated transcription much more efficiently through the CD24 sequence, compared to that of FOXL1, but weaker than CREB3L2ΔTM. P = the activity of the sequence alone.
CONCLUSIONS

Article I
- The short, conserved intergenic sequence between the *RHBDD3* and *EWSR1* TSSs is important for promoter activity.
- Regions of most importance for promoter activity, in both orientations, are localized to the area surrounding the TSSs.
- The promoter activity of some regions are likely to be orientation or cell type-dependent.
- *EWSR1* and *RHBDD3* are expressed across normal tissues and in ESFT tumors and cell lines.
- The *EWSR1* promoter region shares features with bi-directional and house-keeping gene promoters, and is likely to regulate also *RHBDD3*.

Article II
- Recurrent *EWSR1* rearrangements may be found also in epithelial tumor types.
- The *EWSR1-POU5F1* fusion provides a further genetic link between hidradenoma and MEC.
- The EWSR1-POU5F1 chimera is a stronger transcriptional activator than wt POU5F1 and can activate transcription from POU5F1 binding sites, although not as efficiently as the wt proteins.
- Translocation may be a mechanism of POU5F1 reactivation.
Conclusions

Article III
- CREB3L2 is similar to CREB3L1 and related proteins, and expressed across normal tissues
- CREB3L2 and FUS-CREB3L2 seem to undergo RIP, just like CREB3L1
- The TAD of CREB3L2 is weaker than that of FUS and accordingly, the FUS-CREB3L2 chimera is a stronger transcriptional activator than CREB3L2
- FUS-CREB3L2 is the most efficient activator through the selected TFBSs and the HSPA5 promoter, whereas FUS-CREB3L2∆TM is the weakest

Article IV
- The gene expression profile of LGFMS is distinct from histologically similar tumors
- The only recurrent genomic aberrations in LGFMS are associated with the formation of the fusion gene or supernumerary ring chromosomes
- FOXL1 is specifically upregulated in LGFMS and may be involved in the regulation of a subset of the LGFMS upregulated genes that contain overrepresented FOX binding sites
- CD24 is specifically upregulated in LGFMS and FUS-CREB3L2 expressing cells
- FUS-CREB3L2 activated transcription of CD24, suggesting that the expression of this gene is FUS-CREB3L2 dependent, whereas the expression of FOXL1 is not

I Studie I karakteriserades \textit{EWSR1} genens promotor eftersom den styr uttrycket av de fusionsgener som involverar \textit{EWSR1}. Vi identifierade små regioner som var viktiga för promotoraktivitet och fann att \textit{EWSR1} promotorn troligtvis också reglerar \textit{RHBDD3}, en annan cancerrelaterad gen. Våra resultat utgör ett viktigt fundament för att förstå hur dessa gener regleras. I Studie II identifierades fusionsgenen \textit{EWSR1-POU5F1} i två olika körteltumörtyper, det första fyndet av en \textit{EWSR1} fusionsgen i epiteliala tumörtyper. Utöver de histopatologiska likheter som dessa tumörtyper uppvisar, indikerar de genetiska fynden att de aktuella tumörtyperna har liknande ursprung. Vi visade också att fusionsproteinet EWSR1-POU5F1 var
en effektiv transkriptionsaktivator, i likhet med andra EWSR1 fusionsproteiner, som kunde aktivera transkription genom DNA sekvenser som normalt påverkas av POU5F1. Det är möjligt att EWSR1-POU5F1 bidrar till tumöruppkomst genom att aktivera gener som normalt regleras av POU5F1.
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