Small supernumerary marker chromosomes derived from chromosomes 6 and 20 in a woman with recurrent spontaneous abortions.

Narjes Guediche, Lucie Tosca, Marc Nouchy, Laure Lecerf, Dominique Cornet, Sophie Brisset, Michel Goossens, Gérard Tachdjian

Title

Small supernumerary marker chromosomes derived from chromosomes 6 and 20 in a woman with recurrent spontaneous abortions

Authors

Narjes Guediche[a,b,*], Lucie Tosca[a,b], Marc Nouchy[a,c], Laure Lecerf[d], Dominique Cornet[e], Sophie Brisset[a], Michel Goossens[d], Gérard Tachdjian[a,b]

[a]Université Paris-Sud, Service d'Histologie Embryologie et Cytogénétique, APHP, Hôpital Antoine Béclère, 157, rue de la Porte de Trivaux, 92141 Clamart, France

[b]INSERM U935, 92141 Clamart, France

[c]Service de Génétique, Laboratoire d'Eylau, 92200 Neuilly Sur Seine, France

[d]Plateforme de Génomique IMRB 955, Hôpital Henri Mondor, 94010 Créteil, France

[e]Gynécologie-Obstétrique, 10 rue Jean Richepin, 75116 Paris, France

Corresponding author: Dr Narjes Guediche

Address: Service d'Histologie-Embryologie et Cytogénétique

Hôpital Antoine Béclère, 157 rue de la Porte de Trivaux, 92141 Clamart, France

Mail : narjes.guediche@yahoo.fr

Tél: +33 6 67 62 46 26

Fax: +33 1 45 37 49 20

Running title

Multiple sSMC associated with recurrent abortions

Abstract

In this report, we describe a case of multiple small supernumerary marker chromosomes (sSMC) presenting with recurrent abortions. Peripheral blood lymphocytes of a young, healthy and non consanguineous couple who asked for genetic evaluation after two spontaneous miscarriages were obtained for karyotypes. Lymphocytes of the woman were analyzed by FISH techniques and DNA was extracted and used for array CGH investigation.

Karyotyping revealed 48,XX,+2mar[24]/47,XX,+mar[5]/46,XX[3] for the woman and 46,XY for her husband. FISH analysis showed that the two sSMC consisted of chromosomes 6 and 20. Array CGH analysis showed gains of the 6p11.2q12 (9 Mb) and 20p11.21 (3.3 Mb) chromosomal regions with a total of 42 genes present on both sSMC. Our findings support also the hypothesis that the modification of the expression of some genes involved in embryo implantation, like *THBD* gene, could be responsible in the recurrent abortions.

This report underpins the necessity of array CGH for characterizing precisely sSMC and helping in genotype-phenotype correlations. Furthermore, a literature review on sSMC is included.

Key words

small supernumerary marker chromosomes (sSMC), array CGH, FISH, recurrent abortions

Introduction

Infertility and sterility are occurring in approximately 15% of the couples wishing to start a family (1). It has been suggested that infertility may be due to different causes

such as systemic infections, endocrine and immunology disorders or cytogenetic alterations. One important cause of infertility is the presence of a chromosomal aberration in one member of the couple. In the general population, there is a 0.85% frequency of chromosomal aberrations (2). However, it has been reported that in couples with repeated spontaneous abortions, this frequency is about 2.4%-6.8%, women being more frequently affected (3, 4). Cytogenetic analysis of aborted fetus showed that 50-70% of them had a chromosome rearrangement (5, 6). Among the parental karyotypes of the couples presenting with recurrent spontaneous abortions, a small supernumerary marker chromosome (sSMC) was found in less than 1% (7).

sSMC are defined as structurally abnormal chromosomes that cannot be identified or characterized by conventional-banding cytogenetic techniques alone. sSMC are generally equal in size or smaller than chromosome 20 of the same metaphase spread (8). sSMC have been observed in cancer, congenital malformations and/or intellectual disability, reproductive disorders and during prenatal diagnosis (9-11). In a review published by Liehr et al. in 2007 (12), the sSMC frequency was estimated at 0.044% in newborns, 0.075% in prenatal cases, 0.288% in patients with intellectual disability and 0.122% in infertile patients. The chromosomal origin of these sSMC remains usually unknown by conventional cytogenetic techniques but the development of molecular technologies based on fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH) and array comparative genomic hybridization (array CGH) has allowed for important progress toward this goal. Here we describe the combined use of conventional cytogenetic, FISH and array CGH for the detection and characterization of multiple sSMC carried by a woman that has experienced two repeated spontaneous abortions.

Patient data

A non consanguineous 28-year-old couple was referred for genetic evaluation because they had two natural conceptions ending in spontaneous abortions after six weeks of gestation. Physical examinations, especially gynecological and urological examinations, were normal. Laboratory data showed no biological, hormonal, coagulation or semen anomalies. The couple had a normal phenotype and no developmental delay, learning problems or intellectual disability. The family history revealed five healthy children and four spontaneous miscarriages in the woman's mother. The parents and family members were unavailable for chromosome analysis. Cytogenetic analysis showed a normal karyotype 46,XY for the man but an abnormal one for his wife: 48,XX,+2mar[24]/47,XX,+mar[5]/46,XX[3].

Methods

Conventional and FISH cytogenetic experiments

Standard chromosome analyses were performed from cultured peripheral lymphocytes of the couple using standard procedures (G-band by trypsin using Giemsa (GTG), R-band after heat denaturation and Giemsa (RHG) banding techniques and Giemsa staining).

FISH analyses were performed on lymphocyte metaphase spreads of the woman. The following probes were used according to manufacturer's recommendations: whole chromosome painting probes specific for chromosomes 6 and 20 (Kreatech, Amsterdam, The Netherlands), chromosomes 6 and 20 centromeric probes (Vysis, Downers Grove, USA), a pancentromeric probe specific for all chromosomes (QBiogene, Illkirch, France) and a pantelomeric probe specific for all chromosomes (Cambio, Cambridge, UK). Bacterial artificial chromosome (BAC) clones specific for

the 20p chromosomal region (RP4-580G13, RP1-234M6 and RP5-1025A1 located at 20p11.21 and RP4-760C5 located at 20p11.1) were used (Bluegnome, Cambridge, UK).

Array CGH analysis

Genomic DNA of the patient was isolated from peripheral blood using a DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen, Courtaboeuf, France). The extracted DNA concentration was estimated using a NanoDrop ND-1000 spectrophotometer (NanoDrop Technologies, Wilmington, DE, USA). Genomic imbalances were analyzed by array CGH using a 244k oligonucleotide array (Hu-244A, Agilent Technologies, Massy, France). Hybridization was performed according to the manufacturer's recommended protocol and as previously described (13). Captured images were processed with Feature Extraction software (10.7.3.1) and data analysis was performed with Genomic Workbench V5.0.14 (Agilent Technologies). The genomic positions were determined using the version 18 of the Human Genome (http://genome.ucsc.edu/). The ADM2 algorithm was used for statistical analysis. Copy number variations (CNV) were considered significant if they were defined by three or more contiguous oligonucleotides spanned at least 40 kb, contained at least one gene and were not identified in the Database of Genomic Variants at the Centre for Applied Genomics (http://projects.tcag.ca/cgi-bin/variation/gbrowse/hg18/).

Results

Cytogenetic analyses of cultured lymphocytes using GTG, RHG banding techniques and Giemsa staining revealed a normal karyotype for the man (46,XY). For the woman, a mosaicism containing three cell lines was observed among 32 analyzed

cells: normal cells (9.4%), cells with one sSMC (15.6%) and cells with two sSMC (75%) that define karyotype 48,XX,+2mar[24]/47,XX,+mar[5]/46,XX[3]. The first sSMC had a larger size than the second sSMC (Fig. 1A). Giemsa staining showed a symmetric and a non-satellited aspect of both sSMC (Fig. 1B(c)).

Further array CGH analysis showed a gain of 6p11.2q11.1 (5.4Mb, Fig. 2A), a gain of 6q11.1q12 (3.6Mb, Fig. 2A) and a gain of 20p11.21 (3.3Mb, Fig. 2B) chromosomal regions. Thus, 9Mb and 3.3Mb chromosomal regions containing euchromatin were amplified on chromosomes 6 and 20, respectively. Seven genes were amplified on chromosomes 6 and thirty-five genes on chromosome 20 (Table 1). Analyses revealed no other variations that were not known as polymorphisms according to the Database of Genomic Variants.

FISH analysis using WCP probe specific for chromosome 6 showed hybridization on both normal chromosomes 6 and on the larger sSMC (Fig. 1B(d), 1C). FISH analysis using WCP probe specific for chromosome 20 showed hybridization on both normal chromosomes 20 and on the smaller sSMC (Fig. 1B(d), 1C). No additional hybridization signal was detected on other chromosomes, eliminating an insertion or a translocation elsewhere. The chromosome 6 centromeric probe hybridized on both normal chromosomes 6 and on the sSMC(6) (Fig. 1B(e), 1C). The chromosome 20 centromeric probe hybridized on both normal chromosomes 20 but no signal was detected on the sSMC(20) (Fig. 1B(e), 1C). Further analysis with the pancentromeric mixture specific for alpha-satellite common sequences of all chromosomes showed a fluorescent signal on the 46 normal chromosomes and on both sSMC (Fig. 1B(f)). The pantelomeric probe specific for all chromosomes showed signals on all

chromosomes but not on the two sSMC. These results could suggest a ring structure of both sSMC. This might explain the mosaïcism observed in the analyzed cells and also, because of the mitotic formation of double rings, the difference in size of the sSMC(6) (Fig. 1B(a) and (c)). BAC clones RP4-580G13, RP1-234M6, RP5-1025A1 located at 20p11.21 and RP4-760C5 located at 20p11.1 gave one signal on each normal chromosomes 20 and one signal on sSMC(20) and three signals when analyzed on interphasic nuclei.

Thus, the patient carried an abnormal karyotype with two sSMC in the majority of the cells; a larger sSMC derived from chromosome 6 with an original centromere and a smaller sSMC derived from chromosome 20 with a centromere without specific sequences of the centromere of chromosome 20. Based on the FISH and array CGH analyses, the patient's karyotype was defined as 48,XX,+2mar[24]/47,XX,+mar[5]/46,XX[3].ish der(6)(wcp6+,D6Z1+),der(20)(wcp20+,RP4-580G13+,RP1-234M6+,RP5-1025A1+,RP4-760C5+,D20Z1-).arr 6p11.2q11.1(57,354,689-62,746,115)x3,6q11.1q12(62,757,919-66,400,962)x3,20p11.21p11.1(22,833,806-26,156,226)x3 according to ISCN 2009 nomenclature.

Discussion

Our report described a woman carrying two sSMC derived from chromosomes 6 and 20 presenting with recurrent abortions without further clinical symptoms. Array CGH showed that these sSMC corresponded to the 6p11.2q12 and 20p11.21 chromosomal regions, resulting in partial trisomies.

The interpretation of the clinical significance of sSMC is extremely problematic as sSMC have heterogeneous phenotypic consequences. Their effects seem to depend on the origin, size, content and the structure of the sSMC as well as the degree of mosaicism, the varying amounts of euchromatin and their parental origin when the marker contains imprinted genes (14, 15). To date, only two studies using array CGH have been performed on sSMC in relation with spontaneous abortions (16, 17) (Table 2). Whether the sSMC is a cause or a coincidental finding is still questionable since the mechanism by which sSMC influence fertility has not yet been understood (18). In almost 50% of cases the etiology of recurrent abortions is unknown. The causes are heterogeneous and include endocrine dysfunction, autoimmune disorders, genetic abnormalities, maternal and paternal age, infectious diseases, environmental toxins and congenital or structural uterine anomalies (7). Almost 15-20% of all pregnancies end up as spontaneous abortions, out of which the contribution of chromosomal abnormalities is as high as 70%. Frequency of sSMC detected in infertile patients is higher than that in general population (0.125% *versus* 0.044%) and it is also different between male (0.165%) and female infertility (0.022%) (12). An enhanced rate of recurrent abortions in sSMC carriers or their partners has been observed in 26-37% of the cases (18). Kumar et al. (1997) (35) showed that 4.4% of sSMC pregnancies end in stillbirth or spontaneous abortion. The presence of two sSMC in our patient could disturb correct chromosome pairing by an unequal crossing over during meiosis, which can result in gametes with unbalanced chromosomes like duplications or deletions. The clinical consequences of such imbalances usually are lethal to the developing embryo leading to spontaneous abortions or early neonatal deaths. Also, the consequences could be more serious if the sSMC is present in a non-mosaic state in the fetus.

To date, some reports about recurrent abortions with sSMC have already been published (Table 2) (5, 11, 16-34). Usually, sSMC derived from chromosomes 6 and 20 are rare and comprise 0.54% and 1.2% of all sSMC respectively. About 37% of carriers of sSMC derived from chromosomes 6 and 20 are clinically normal (36). In our case, a normal phenotype was observed for the woman. Among the 20 cases of sSMC(6) described in the literature including our study, our patient is the first case of female described with recurrent abortions. sSMC(20) seems to be more frequent as 46 cases were previously described. Among these cases, one woman presented an unexplained infertility, two women a primary amenorrhea (18, 37) and a man an azoospermia (18). All these cases were not studied at a molecular level with array CGH, so the exact size of sSMC and gene content remained unknown (38). In the 59 published cases of multiple sSMC (i.e. more than one sSMC in cells), sSMC(6) is present in near 18% of them. sSMC(6) and sSMC(8) are the more frequently markers represented in cases of multiple sSMC and chromosome 6 seems to be over-represented in multiple sSMC cases reported to date compared to their contribution to single sSMC (39). This might point towards a specific way of formation of multiple sSMC during meiosis (40).

A detailed molecular cytogenetic characterization using array CGH is needed to evaluate the size and the genomic constitution of sSMC with precision. The varying degrees of phenotypic abnormality observed in several patients are most probably due to the different DNA sequences and thus gene content of the sSMC. Our patient presented two sSMC. In the 9Mb DNA sequences present on the sSMC(6), 7 genes are mapped (Table 1). To our knowledge, none of them were described associated

with infertility or pregnancy impairment. In the 3.3Mb DNA sequences located on the sSMC(20), 35 genes are mapped (Table 1). Among them, the *THBD* gene codes for the thrombomodulin, an endothelial-associated anticoagulant protein involved in the control of hemostasis and inflammation at the vascular beds (41). This protein is also a cofactor of the protein C anticoagulant pathway and is expressed mainly on the endothelial surface of blood vessels and in the placental syncytiotrophoblast cells (42). Various components of the coagulation and fibrinolytic pathways are involved in normal embryonic implantation, trophoblast invasion and placentation. Recurrent abortions are characterized by defective placentation and microthrombi in the placental vasculature (43). Although recurrent spontaneous abortions are a heterogeneous condition, the relationship between abnormalities in the hemostatic pathways and pregnancy outcome is increasingly recognized (44). Considering the crucial role of thrombomodulin in coagulation and in embryonic development, we hypothesize that a modification of its expression reveals an increase in procoagulant activity, which could be secondary to endothelial damage or coagulation activation and then involved in the pathogenesis of pregnancy loss.

In conclusion, the behavior of both sSMC(6) and sSMC(20) in relation to fetal loss of our patient has been a subject of scrutiny and debate. Our findings support also the hypothesis that the modification of the expression of some genes, like *THBD*, could be directly responsible in the repeated spontaneous abortions.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank A Aboura and M Lelorc'h for generously providing some chromosome probes. They thank all the technical team for help with array CGH

experiments.

Figure titles and legends

Figure 1: Conventional and FISH cytogenetic findings.

A: Metaphase with R-banding showing the two sSMC (arrows).

B: Results for sSMC(6) and sSMC(20).

(a) G-band by trypsin using Giemsa.

(b) R-band after heat denaturation and Giemsa.

(c) Giemsa staining.

(d) WCP 6 (d1) and WCP 20 (d2) specific probes.

(e) CEP 6 (e1) and CEP 20 (e2) specific probes.

(f) Pancentromeric probe specific for all chromosomes

C: FISH on metaphase spread using WCP 6 (green), WCP 20 (red), CEP 6 (red) and CEP 20 (green) showing chromosomes 6 and 20, and the two sSMC (arrows).

Figure 2: Array CGH using 244k oligonucleotide arrays showing a global 9Mb gain in 6p11.2-q11.1 and 6q11.1-q12 (A) and a 3.3Mb gain in 20p11.21 (B).

Tables

Table 1: Genes present on respective sSMC, protein encoded and their function (Pubmed [Internet]: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/).

Table 2: sSMC associated with recurrent miscarriages described in the literature.

References

1. Harton GL, Tempest HG. Chromosomal disorders and male infertility. Asian J Androl 2012;14(1):32-9.

2. Nielsen J and Wohlert M. Chromosome abnormalities found among 34,910 newborn children: results from a 13-year incidence study in Arhus, Denmark. Hum Genet 1991;87:81–83.

3. Clementini E, Palka C, Iezzi I, Stuppia L, Guanciali-Franchi P, et al. Prevalence of chromosomal abnormalities in 2078 infertile couples referred for assisted reproductive techniques. Hum Reprod 2005;20:437-42.

4. Butnariu L, Covic M, Onofriescu M, Grămescu M, Bujoran C, Caba L, et al. Chromosomal evaluation in couples with reproductive disorders-retrospective study of a selected group of 266 couples. Rev Med Chir Soc Med Nat Iasi 2010;114(4):1107-13.

5. Balkan M, Isi H, Gedik A, Erdemoğlu M, Budak T. A small supernumerary marker chromosome, derived from chromosome 22, possibly associated with repeated spontaneous abortions. Genet Mol Res 2010;9(3):1683-9.

6. Kwinecka-Dmitriew B, Zakrzewska M, Latos-Bieleńska A, Skrzypczak J. Frequency of chromosomal aberrations in material from abortions. Ginekol Pol 2010;81(12):896-901.

7. Dutta UR, Rajitha P, Pidugu VK, Dalal AB. Cytogenetic abnormalities in 1162

301 couples with recurrent miscarriages in Southern region of India: report and review. J
302 Assist Reprod Genet 2011;28(2):145-9.
303
304 8. Liehr T, Claussen U, Starke H. Small supernumerary marker chromosomes
305 (sSMC) in humans. Cytogenet Genome Res 2004;107:55-67.
306
307 9. Li MM, Howard-Peebles PN, Killos LD, Fallon L, Listgarten E, Stanley WS.
308 Characterization and clinical implications of marker chromosomes identified at
309 prenatal diagnosis. Prenat Diagn 2000;20:138-43.
310
311 10. Eggermann K, Mau UA, Bujdoso G, Koltai E, Engels H, Schubert R, et al.
312 Supernumerary marker chromosomes derived from chromosome 15: analysis of 32
313 new cases. Clin Genet 2002;62:89-93.
314
315 11. Liehr T, Mrasek K, Weise A, Dufke A, Rodriguez L, Martinez Guardia N, et al.
316 Small supernumerary marker chromosomes-progress towards a genotype-phenotype
317 correlation. Cytogenet Genome Res 2006;112:23-34.
318
319 12. Liehr T, Weise A. Frequency of small supernumerary marker chromosomes in
320 prenatal, newborn, developmentally retarded and infertility diagnostics. Int J Mol Med
321 2007;19(5):719-731.
322
323 13. Tosca L, Brisset S, Petit F, Metay C, Latour S, Lautier B, et al. Genotype-
324 phenotype correlation in 13q13.3q21.3 deletion. Eur J Med Genet 2011;54(5):e489-
325 94.

14. Graf MD, Christ L, Mascarello JT, Mowrey P, Pettenati M, Stetten G, et al. Redefining the risks of prenatally ascertained supernumerary marker chromosomes: a collaborative study. J Med Genet 2006;43:660-664.

15. Santos M, Mrasek K, Rigola MA, Starke H, Liehr T, Fuster C. Identification of a "cryptic mosaicism" involving at least four different small supernumerary marker chromosomes derived from chromosome 9 in a woman without reproductive success. Fertil Steril 2007;88(4):969.e11-7.

16. Barber JCK, Huang S, Beal S, Bunyan D, Maloney VK, Collinson M, Crolla JA. sSMC characterization by array-CGH. (Newsletter) ECA 2009;24:p12.

17. Sheth F, Andrieux J, Ewers E, Kosyakova N, Weise A, Sheth H, et al. Characterization of sSMC by FISH and molecular techniques. Eur J Med Genet 2011;54:247-255.

18. Manvelyan M, Riegel M, Santos M, Fuster C, Pellestor F, Mazaurik ML, et al. Thirty-two new cases with small supernumerary marker chromosomes detected in connection with fertility problems: detailed molecular cytogenetic characterization and review of the literature. Int J Mol Med 2008;21:705-714.

19. Lee B, Park S, Lee M, Kim J, Park J, Han J, Kang I, Yang K, Ryu H. Characterization of mosaic supernumerary marker chromosomes using MFISH: origin from chromosome 1, 16 and 17. Chr Res 2009;17(Supl.1):S180.

20. Liehr T, Wegner RD, Stumm M, Martin T, Gillessen-Kaesbach G, Kosyakova N, Ewers E, Hamid AB, von Eggeling F, Hentschel J, Ziegler M, Weise A. Three new cases with small supernumerary marker chromosomes 1 and normal phenotype. J Chin Med Assoc 2010;73:205-207.

21. Liehr T, Hickmann G, Kozlowski P, Claussen U, Starke H. Molecular-cytogenetic characterization of the origin and presence of pericentromeric euchromatin on minute supernumerary marker chromosomes (SMCs). Chromosome Res 2004;12:239-244.

22. McAuliffe F, Winsor EJ, Chitayat D. Tetrasomy 9p mosaicism associated with a normal phenotype. Fetal Diagn Ther 2005;20(3):219-222.

23. Mignon C, Malzac P, Moncla A, Depetris D, Roeckel N, Croquette MF, Mattei MG. Clinical heterogeneity in 16 patients with inv dup 15 chromosome: cytogenetic and molecular studies, search for an imprinting effect. Eur J Hum Genet 1996;4(2):88-100.

24. Huang B, Crolla JA, Christian SL, Wolf-Ledbetter ME, Macha ME, Papenhausen PN, Ledbetter DH. Refined molecular characterization of the breakpoints in small inv dup(15) chromosomes. Hum Genet 1997;99(1):11-17.

25. de Albuquerque Coelho KE, Egashira M, Kato R, Fujimoto M, Matsumoto N, Rerkamnuaychoke B, Abe K, Harada N, Ohashi H, Fukushima Y, Niikawa N. Diagnosis of four chromosome abnormalities of unknown origin by chromosome

376 microdissection and subsequent reverse and forward painting. Am J Med Genet
377 1996;63(3):468-471.
378
379 26. Manenti E. Two extra inv dup(15) chromosomes and male infertility: second
380 case. Am J Med Genet 1992;42(3):402-3.
381
382 27. Polityko AD, Lazjuk GI, Liehr T. High resolution molecular cytogenetic
383 approaches and study of marker chromosomes. Medica Genetics 2008;7(3):34-40.
384
385 28. Nietzel A, Rocchi M, Starke H, Heller A, Fiedler W, Wlodarska I, Loncarevic IF,
386 Beensen V, Claussen U, Liehr T. A new multicolor-FISH approach for the
387 characterization of marker chromosomes: centromere-specific multicolor-FISH
388 (cenM-FISH). Hum Genet 2001;108(3):199-204.
389
390 29. Maraschio P, Cuoco C, Gimelli G, Zuffardi O, Tiepolo L. Origin and clinical
391 significance of inv dup(15). In : Alan R. Liss. The cytogenetics of mamalian
392 autosomal rearrangements 1988;615-634.
393
394 30. Cotter PD, Ko E, Larabell SK, Rademaker AW, Martin RH. Segregation of a
395 supernumerary del(15) marker chromosome in sperm. Clin Genet 2000;58(6):488-
396 492.
397
398 31. Winsor EJ, Van Allen MI. Familial marker chromosome due to 3:1 disjunction of
399 t(9;15) in a grandparent. Prenat Diagn 1989;9(12):851-855.
400

401 32. Plattner R, Heerema NA, Patil SR, Howard-Peebles PN, Palmer
402 CG. Characterization of seven DA/DAPI-positive bisatellited marker chromosomes by
403 in situ hybridization. Hum Genet 1991;87(3):290-296.
404
405 33. Chen CP, Lin CC, Su YN, Tsai FJ, Chen JT, Chern SR, Lee CC, Town DD, Chen
406 LF, Wu PC, Wang W. Prenatal diagnosis and molecular cytogenetic characterization
407 of a small supernumerary marker chromosome derived from chromosome 18 and
408 associated with a reciprocal translocation involving chromosomes 17 and 18. Taiwan
409 J Obstet Gynecol 2010;49(2):188-191.
410
411 34. Wiland E, Jarmuz M, Kurpisz M. Segregation of the marker chromosome der(20)
412 in the sperm of a male with karyotype 46,XY[96]/47,XY+mar[4]. Med Sci Monit
413 2005;11(3):CS9-15.
414
415 35. Kumar C, Svetlana MK, Rhea VS, Ram SV. Marker chromosomes in fetal loss.
416 Hum Reprod 1997;12:1321-1324.
417
418 36. Liehr T. Small supernumerary marker chromosomes [Internet]. Accessed 2012
419 Feb 28. Available from: http://www.fish.uniklinikum-jena.de/sSMC.html.
420
421 37. Stankiewicz P, Bocian E, Jakubow-Durska K, Obersztyn E, Lato E, Starke H, et
422 al. Identification of supernumerary marker chromosomes derived from chromosomes
423 5, 6, 19, and 20 using FISH. J Med Genet 2000;37(2):114-120.
424
425 38. Guediche N, Tosca L, Kara Terki A, Bas C, Lecerf L, Young J, Briand-Suleau A,

426 Tou B, Bouligand J, Brisset S, Misrahi M, Guiochon-Mantel A, Goossens M,
427 Tachdjian G. Array comparative genomic hybridization analysis of small
428 supernumerary marker chromosomes in human infertility. Reprod Biomed Online
429 2012;24:72-82.
430
431 39. Liehr T, Starke H, Senger G, Melotte C, Weise A, Vermeesch JR.
432 Overrepresentation of small supernumerary marker chromosomes (sSMC) from
433 chromosome 6 origin in cases with multiple sSMC. Am J Med Genet A
434 2006;140(1):46-51.
435
436 40. Fernández-Toral J, Rodríguez L, Plasencia A, Martínez-Frías ML, Ewers E,
437 Hamid AB, et al. Four small supernumerary marker chromosomes derived from
438 chromosomes 6, 8, 11 and 12 in a patient with minimal clinical abnormalities: a case
439 report. J Med Case Reports 2010;4:239.
440
441 41. Anastasiou G, Gialeraki A, Merkouri E, Politou M, Travlou A. Thrombomodulin as
442 a regulator of the anticoagulant pathway: implication in the development of
443 thrombosis. Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis 2012;23(1):1-10.
444
445 42. Stortoni P, Cecati M, Giannubilo SR, Sartini D, Turi A, Emanuelli M, et al.
446 Placental thrombomodulin expression in recurrent miscarriage. Reprod Biol
447 Endocrinol 2010;8:1.
448
449 43. Van Dreden P, Woodhams B, Rousseau A, Favier M, Favier R. Comparative
450 evaluation of Tissue factor and Thrombomodulin activity changes during normal and

451 idiopathic early and late foetal loss: The cause of hypercoagulability? Thromb Res, In
452 Press, DOI:10.1016/j.thromres.2011.08.008.
453
454 44. de Saint Martin L, Duchemin J, Bohec C, Couturaud F, Mottier D, Collet M, et al.
455 Increased thrombin generation measured in the presence of thrombomodulin in
456 women with early pregnancy loss. Fertil Steril 2011;95(5):1813-5.e1.